

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1880.

The Week.

DURING the week the value of foreign gold which arrived here exceeded \$4,000,000, and foreign exchange still rules at rates which warrant further imports, although at the close of the week the tone of this market was firmer. The New York banks have difficulty, however, in maintaining their reserve, although in addition to the foreign specie arriving the Treasury continues out of its receipts to return more than \$2,500,000 to the loan market each week, by purchasing bonds for the sinking fund. The loans and discounts of the banks of this city now amount to \$313,700,000 against about \$257,000,000 a year ago, when speculation in every market was "booming." There is now an absence of "boom" in any quarter, but the volume of legitimate business is enormous, as is shown by Clearing-house returns, by the receipts of transportation companies, and by the nearly unanimous reports of business men in a position to speak intelligently. At the Stock Exchange the tendency of prices was upwards until the Maine election, when there was a halt in the "bull speculation," which was followed by depression and what the brokers call a "feverish market." The prominence of the Greenback party in the vote, together with the willingness of the Democrats to stand on the Greenback platform, at least for this election, gave to the victory of the "Fusionists" a financial significance not at all pleasant to holders of securities. U. S. 4 per cents, however, did not decline, although other issues of the Government receded a fraction. The floating stock of U. S. bonds in Wall Street is very small. Silver was very steady in price here and in London; and the bullion value of the "buzzard dollar" at the close was about 87½ cents.

The Maine election has resulted in the success of a single officer on the Fusion State ticket—the Governor—by a majority of about one thousand, the choice of a Republican Legislature, and the maintenance of the existing complexion of the Congressional delegation. Mixed as is this result, it has cast a damper on the Republican spirits, in spite of the reflection that at the November election it is more than likely that the vote of the State will be given for Garfield. In the moral aspect it appears at first sight shocking that there should not have been a decisive reaction against the frauds exposed last winter, but several considerations will serve to encourage those who lament the decline of New England integrity. In the first place, a certain number of prohibitionists, sufficient, no doubt, to turn the scale, voted for Plaisted, the Fusionist and ex-Republican, with the distinct object of punishing Governor Davis for his want of loyalty to their cause. In the next place, a motive must be found for the continued exile from the party of the eight thousand Republicans who, between 1876 and 1879, went over to the opposition. If part of these were tinctured with the Greenback heresy, another and a very respectable part are known to have been disgusted with Republican management and "magnetism." Governor Davis is a part of the machine which Mr. Blaine still controls, and to it and them there is naturally no diminution of repugnance, whose intensity is shown by its temporary alliance with folly on the currency question and the fraudulent spirit of the Garcelonites. This, it must be confessed, is a much more comforting as well as more plausible theory than that the majority are rascals; and yet we have no doubt that good Republicans generally would prefer to believe Mr. Blaine's explanation, in a despatch to General Garfield, that bribery did it, and that "such scenes were never before witnessed in Maine."

The "news from Maine" is said to have spread a panic among the office-holders in Washington, and no wonder. It has probably spread a panic among them all over the country, because it makes it more likely than ever that they will lose their places. Their case is peculiarly hard owing to the fact that the heavy income-tax levied on them by the Republican Committee differs from an ordinary tax authorized by law,

in that it promises no certain return. For the ordinary legal tax the taxpayer is sure to receive the equal protection of the laws and security for the fruits of his industry; while the office-holder's income-tax resembles money put into a lottery ticket, or into the margin of a stock speculation, or into a racing pool. It is in the nature of a bet made on an extremely uncertain event, and the worst of it is that the unfortunate speculator makes the bet against his will. He is somewhat in the position Mr. Belmont's clerks would be if their employer forced them to back his horses out of their salaries. Nay, it is much worse; for the clerks, if the horses were beaten, would only lose the amount they had laid on the race, while if the Federal officers lose they are deprived of their means of livelihood. The time will come when the American people will look back with horror to their permitting or authorizing the agony of suspense and anxiety in which tens of thousands of persons in their employ pass the six months previous to the Presidential election. The mere barbarity of the thing, even if it worked no injury to the state, ought to condemn it in the eyes of any Christian, or even civilized, people. No government which allows an efficient and upright servant to be tortured before every election in order to make the politicians' game more exciting ought in our day to call itself enlightened—without a certain bashfulness of manner, at all events.

The Republican majority in Vermont turns out to have been just about 25,000, and the net gain over the majority of 1876 somewhat more than 1,300. The Greenback vote has thus pretty much been recovered, and we do not know that the election has any other "moral" unless it be the proverbial tenacity of parties in this country—the grand division remaining substantially the same, under changed names, from generation to generation. The latest intelligence from Arkansas leaves it doubtful whether the repudiating amendment has been defeated, though such is probably the case. Nothing seems to have given the better class of Democratic organs more joy lately than this unexpected honesty in a State which long ago flung good faith to the winds. The *Boston Post* thinks it "a noticeable fact that this noble position was taken and emphasized coincident with a splendid Democratic majority on the State ticket"; but unhappily the ticket was carried by 60,000 majority, while the amendment is doubtfully defeated. Nor is the nobility of Arkansas's present position so obvious. The amendment was passed by a Democratic legislature in accordance with the recommendation, by public resolution, of a Democratic Convention in the summer of 1878, and restrains the General Assembly from ever paying principal or interest on some three millions of funding bonds issued in 1869-70. Moreover, the prohibition merely confirms the past and actual repudiation, so that the creditor of the State, as of the various municipalities which have followed its example, finds not the smallest consolation in the recent election, even supposing the amendment to be rejected. The returns, by the way, are as yet too meagre to permit of their furnishing any test of the probable accuracy of the census. The Republican strength should be, in the absence of a separate ticket, measurable to a degree in the vote on the amendment, as compared with the straight Democratic vote.

General Logan is the only one of the Bosses attached to General Grant's fortunes who has as yet taken any part in the canvass. Mr. Cameron's health continues delicate. Mr. Conkling's attitude puzzles even the inner circle of his henchmen. He was in the same hotel with General Garfield at New York but did not call upon him, and kept himself so close that the committee did not know his whereabouts, and were telegraphing all over the country for him, when he was under the same roof. Since then he has written a letter in which he makes no mention of the Republican candidates, and his intimate friends are not yet able to say whether he will make a speech or not. He probably will make one speech, as in the campaign of 1876. This is all the more curious considering the eagerness he showed at Chicago to bind the delegates in advance to the support of the nominee of the Convention,

whoever he might be, on pain of expulsion. It of course raises a good deal of doubt whether the nomination of General Arthur was not a blunder after all; that is, whether the expected price will be paid for it. It is not at all unlikely that Mr. Conkling prized it simply as an outward and visible sign of his triumph over his enemies, and cares nothing whatever about its effect on the election. If he should now "go back" on the shrewd men who made it, it will be a veritable contribution to the cause of reform from one of its worst enemies. General Garfield's letter of acceptance was undoubtedly also a bid for "the Chieftain's" support, and the contempt with which the Chieftain treats it is not wholly regrettable. No one ever successfully plays any rôle in public or private life which is not natural to his temperament. General Garfield's proper line is the bluff, frank one, and in trying shrewdness on the old masters of the art he naturally exposes himself to the fate which overtakes amateurs who try to outwit horse-dealers. A horse-dealer, unless an uncommon knave, is usually disarmed by a frank confession of ignorance or simplicity, but has no mercy for those who profess to be a match for him in his own game.

Mr. Sherman, in a speech at Richmond, Indiana, last week, defending General Garfield against an attack made on him by Mr. Hendricks touching his action as a visiting statesman at New Orleans in 1876, said:

"Now, I was present with General Garfield at New Orleans on the occasion referred to, and I, with more knowledge of the facts than Governor Hendricks has, deny that the Returning Board made returns against the men who were elected, and for the men who were not elected; but, on the contrary, the Returning Board, in pursuance of the plain provision of the law of Louisiana, did reject from the election returns those from parishes and districts that were controlled by fraud and violence, and in doing so did their plain duty in strict accordance with the law."

This is not a candid statement of the case. The Returning Board was a judicial body empowered to pass on disputed facts, and it acted in this instance with the knowledge that its decision would determine the result of the Presidential election, or, in other words, would award the Presidency. The law provided that both parties should be represented in the Board, each by at least one member, who should participate in the secret deliberations by which the Board formed its judgment. Secretary Sherman knows that this provision of the law was disregarded in 1876—that the Board was composed exclusively and illegally of Republicans, and these Republicans men of poor reputation and violent partisans; and when he says that in rejecting the election returns from certain parishes which gave Democratic majorities the Board "did its plain duty in strict accordance with the law," he asserts something which he does not know to be true, and something which the established presumptions of the jurisprudence of all civilized countries make probably untrue. The decision of an illegally constituted tribunal, composed of men sitting in their own cause and giving judgment by which they expected greatly to profit, and, as a matter of fact, did profit, is, all over the world, presumptively a corrupt decision. The burden of showing that it is not corrupt lies on the tribunal and its friends. General Garfield is a moralist, which Mr. Sherman does not profess to be, and we hope and believe would not now attempt such a defence as this of the Louisiana doings of 1876.

Mr. Bayard's speech at Columbia, S. C., on the issues of the campaign contains nothing that is very new or original, but deserves attention on account of its characteristic difference from ordinary stump-speeches. It consists mainly of an "arraignment" of the Republicans for their insincerity in pretending to be friends of the negro and of the maintenance of the public credit. How can they be friends of the latter, Mr. Bayard asks, when they make alliance with repudiators in Virginia, and when they are the same party which twenty years ago gave the green-back its legal-tender quality? How can they be friends of the former when they give negroes suffrage in the South while refusing them office in the North, and when they actually take away their votes altogether in the District of Columbia? These arguments have a rather old-fashioned sound, and remind the Northern reader of the days before the war when statesmen of the South used to unmask the pretences of the hypocritical Free-soilers. The insincerity of the Republican party might be better shown in a variety of ways than

in those selected by Mr. Bayard. It may be pretty conclusively established, for instance, that a party which insists upon the "Southern question" as the only important one before the country, and at the same time proposes no practical solution of it, must be tainted with insincerity. The affairs connected with the Freedman's Bank also constitute a more serious taint upon the philanthropic record of the party than the fact upon which Mr. Bayard dwells, that the blacks do not get themselves elected to office in Massachusetts or Minnesota. Mr. Bayard's audience seems to have been a good one, and a considerable amount of disappointment has been caused in many newspaper offices by the general calmness of the occasion. There are no accounts of red-shirted men with their belts full of pistols and knives occupying the front seats or platform, and there is almost nothing in the remarks of the orator of the day that will work up well into short sensational campaign paragraphs. It was, like all Mr. Bayard's speeches, addressed chiefly rather to the minds of his hearers than to their passions, and we all know what an odious stumbling-block a speech so addressed is to the paragrapher.

One of the select number of Republican orators who, as we have noted from time to time, take account in their speeches of topics which both parties in Congress ignore, is Mr. S. B. Chittenden. At a large meeting held in the Brooklyn Academy last week he insisted on the main issue being whether Southern statesmanship should again rule the country. An ordinary Stalwart declaimer would have justified his opposition to such a consummation by talk about the undoing of the constitutional amendments, the division of Texas into five States, the payment for the slaves, and the satisfaction of untold Southern claims. Mr. Chittenden did nothing of the sort. He only asked, "Shall the loyal States now surrender to the solid South and New York City the supervision and revision of the national credit, currency, tariff, internal revenue and civil service?" From the repudiation practices of the Southern States he argued the danger of entrusting the national credit to the control of the same section. As to the currency, he said, what is perfectly true, that "the South has held the balance of power and practical control of the House of Representatives for nearly six years, and during all that time has supported with great force the wildest and most inflammable currency projects"; adding, "I can count on the fingers of one hand the Southern men in the House who, in these late years, influentially opposed inflation and favored specie payments." Moreover, "the South in Congress is crazy on the silver question," about which Mr. Chittenden had some timely remarks. If in these he failed to reproach his own party for their share in the present silver inflation, it was evidently by oversight. "The South," he continued, "is confused and impracticable in respect to the tariff and internal-revenue laws. So is the North; so is the New York Chamber of Commerce. . . . But the argument against putting this business into the hands of the solid South is strong and unanswerable in proportion to the difficulties and importance of the subject." Finally, "the solid South and Tammany fairly abhor the faint glimmer of civil-service reform begun in good faith by President Hayes to meet a manifest danger, and promise to substitute for it a system of spoils for the victor." Here again Mr. Chittenden was candid: "It is but fair to admit that some Republicans also ridicule civil-service reform. Nor do the most intimate friends of the President boast much of his success." Nevertheless, "if this work of reform is to go on, the Republicans must push it."

The "exposures" of the week have not been numerous or important. The *Tribune*, however, has managed to show up a Democratic Congressman, named Beltzhoover, who wrote a letter regretting the hostility of the present Democratic House to pension bills, and subsequently denied having done so. E. W. Curriden, it seems, wrote to Beltzhoover, asking him to introduce some such bill, and received in reply a letter in which Beltzhoover used the following striking language: "With the present Democratic House pension bills do not have much favor," adding that "the Rebel general who is at the head of the Pension Committee in the Senate is still more averse to allowing any such bills to pass." This letter having found its way into the columns of the *Tribune*, Beltzhoover denounced it as an "infamous forgery," basing his denial apparently upon an immaterial suppression of a sentence

at the close. This enables the *Tribune*, first, to show that Beltz-hoover "lies, knowingly and wilfully"; second, to use the letter as an admission by a Democratic Congressman that the Democratic party is opposed to pension bills, and, inferentially, that the Democrats hate Union soldiers; thus providing a strong argument why the "soldier vote" should not be cast for Hancock. Curiously enough the Democratic newspapers, instead of retorting that there are many good reasons why pension bills as a class should be closely scrutinized by Congress, seem to be utterly at a loss for any answer, except that Curriden must be a very mean sort of person to let the cat out of the bag; which is true but irrelevant. There is no doubt that the Democratic conscience on the subject of Union soldiers is very sensitive.

We need not call attention to the reply, on another page, to the speech of our friend the Republican emissary at the South. Its moderation and humor will commend it even to those who feel how much still remains to be said on both sides of the debate. For our own part, we could ask no better illustration of the crying need of civil-service reform than our correspondent furnishes in showing how the maintenance of the present Federal office-holders in his State, under the existing political system, handicaps one party in State and municipal elections, with which, of course, these functionaries have no proper concern whatever. Precisely the same thing is true in South Carolina, under the auspices of the Treasury Department, represented by the corrupt Elliott. Now, we have never recommended tolerance of such abuses, but we have insisted that it is more important to change the system than to change the men, and in this we are glad to see that we have the support of a "Virginia Democrat," whose letter immediately follows Mr. Hilton's.

The approaching Democratic Convention to nominate a candidate for the vacancy in the Court of Appeals of this State is of unusual importance, and it is greatly to be hoped that the Bar will make some effort to force the politicians into nominating a good lawyer. The Court at present, though it disposes of business quickly, has a very crowded calendar, and can hardly be called a strong court. Public confidence in it was never very greatly shaken by the political attacks made upon its decisions at the time of the Tweed litigation; but it cannot be denied that the late chief judge was too much of a politician for the perfect discharge of judicial duties. Judge Rapallo has announced in a very frank way that he is a candidate for the vacancy, and, whatever objections there may be to him, his positive professional qualifications for the position are of the first order. He is, in fact, a very excellent judge, whose opinions not only display absolute freedom from political influence, but unusual judicial ability as well. If the Democrats can find any one who would be even probably an improvement upon Judge Rapallo they will be very fortunate. If the Bar does not make some effort in the matter they are not likely even to take the trouble to attempt it.

Mr. Fawcett, the present Postmaster-General in England, has proposed an ingenious and probably very useful supplement to the post-office savings-banks. The number of post-office banks is still limited. In some counties there are only a few, and of course in the country districts they are at some distance from the homes of depositors, and they take no deposits under a quarter of a dollar. Consequently, a great many pence are wasted, simply because the owner does not happen to have enough for a deposit, or, if he has enough, is not willing to take the trouble to go to the office. Mr. Fawcett now proposes to supply forms gratis, to which penny stamps can be attached, and when a form bears twelve stamps credit will be given at the post-office for one shilling to the owner. A man can in this way really make deposits of a penny at a time by buying stamps from any one who happens to keep them. The importance of this lies in the fact that the English laboring population is confessedly the least thrifty in Europe. Foresight and frugality seem to have been killed outright amongst them by the Elizabethan poor-laws, and it will take much time and fostering, both by legislation and education, to restore them.

The conflict of the French Government with the religious orders seems to have entered on a new phase, through a speech of M. de

Freycinet, at Montauban, in which he announced that the decree of expulsion would be enforced against the Jesuits only, and that with regard to the others nothing would be done until the passage of a general law regulating the status of all the religious societies. The original arrangement was that all orders, except the Jesuits, would have to submit their rules for the approval of the Government, and their fate was to depend on their doing this and obtaining the approval. M. de Freycinet's announcement has caused a vehement outcry from the Radical Republican and the reactionary press, both of which treat it as a retreat, and the severe criticism bestowed on it by the *République Française*, Gambetta's paper, has led to the report that Gambetta is so much opposed to the new programme that it will have to be abandoned; but this is stoutly denied.

The issue of a ukase by the Czar, some weeks ago, dissolving the High Commission to which the Government was committed during the Nihilist excitement, and suppressing the famous "Third Section" of the Imperial Chancellery—which had charge of the secret police, and whose mandates overrode all law—transferring the control of the police to the Minister of the Interior, and making General Loris Melikoff Minister of the Interior, appears to be accepted by the Russian press as the close of the late troubles. What is most gratifying about the situation is that it has been brought about in the main by conciliation, and that the Government in abolishing the "Third Section" has not been afraid to acknowledge that the malcontents had some reason in their complaints.

The Prussian National-Liberal party has been sadly demoralized of late by the manner in which Prince Bismarck has turned his back on it. Part of it has continued to support him, rather through habit than from conviction; but the main body has been greatly discouraged and perplexed. An open split has now taken place in its ranks. The secessionists, who refuse to make any terms with the Government, have issued a manifesto at Dantzig, in which they declare that they will support the right of the national representation and labor to found and uphold, both in Prussia and Germany, real parliamentary government, will advocate in the field of public economy the policy of free-trade, and will oppose all modifications in the Falk laws, either as regards the relations of church and state or education and ecclesiastical discipline. This is really the original programme of the party, which its right wing has abandoned in the vain hope of getting the best of a new bargain with the Chancellor. Some of its members he has of late been luring on with hopes of high office, but he has taken care to keep them in a state of expectancy thus far.

The Powers are still trying to get Turkey to surrender Dulcigno to the Montenegrins, and Turkey is still trying not to do it, but is, nevertheless, apparently somewhat nearer doing it than a week ago. The Turkish troops have seized one Albanian position and repulsed an attempt to retake it, which is a good sign as far as it goes. The combined fleet has at last assembled off the coast, so that the naval "demonstration" has begun, but how far it will go—that is, whether it will end in the actual use of force—appears to be still uncertain. There are rumors, and likely ones, that the French ships have orders to retire as soon as a shot is fired. It is hoped that this display of force will satisfy the Sultan's religious scruples, and those of his Mussulman subjects, about surrendering part of the soil of Islam, which the Sacred Law forbids except under overwhelming necessity. He probably hopes to fare better on the Greek question, as in that the fleet can do nothing, and he trusts that the Powers will never agree sufficiently to land troops. The only advance made in the solution of the reform problem in Asia Minor is the presentation of a collective note, which "criticises" severely the account recently given by the Porte of the state of things in Armenia. The Porte is, however, prepared to submit to the most destructive criticism of its state papers, being in fact quite used to it, as long as no attempt is made to embody the criticism in action. We are glad to see our State Department is pressing for the punishment of the murderers of Dr. Parsons, the American missionary. But it must be prepared for a long siege. The murderer of Colonel Comma-roff, the Russian, though convicted months ago, has not been hanged yet.

THE TARIFF IN THE CANVASS.

THERE is nothing on which the two parties now in the field come so near joining issue as the tariff. The Democratic platform declares the party to be in favor of a tariff for revenue only, while the Republican platform declares the party to be in favor of a tariff for the protection of native industry. The difference is a very important one, and we might fairly expect that it would lead to a great deal of discussion of the tariff on the stump. As a matter of fact, there has been hardly any discussion of it at all. "A tariff for revenue only" is a term of uncertain meaning, but no Democratic orator has attempted, so far as our observation has gone, to fix the sense in which the Democratic party uses it. It may mean, and in Democratic mouths probably does mean, a tariff of low duties on all or nearly all the articles now dutiable, leaving the required amount of revenue to be made up by the increase of importation. But it may also mean a tariff like that of Great Britain, which would raise the required revenue on a very few articles, partly of luxury and partly of prime necessity. Either of these modes of raising the revenue would involve changes which would very seriously affect most of the industries now in operation, and for which the country could only be prepared and ought to be prepared by very full and minute discussion. Of any such discussion we do not hear a word from any Democratic orator. We know of no Democratic politician who appears to have given any special attention to the subject, or, indeed, to be particularly interested in it, or whom the public, if won over to the change, would be willing to trust to draft legislation for the purpose of bringing it about.

"A tariff for protection" is also a term of very vague import. The present tariff was not enacted as such a tariff. It was, as originally imposed, a scheme devised in haste, in a time of great national anxiety and distress, for raising the largest possible amount of money by any means which came to hand. Accordingly, it consisted of a string of duties clapped on everything of which the legislature could hear or think as likely to be brought for sale to this country by foreigners. It bore, in fact, in the beginning, the appearance of an attempt at that general prohibitory protection under which every branch of native industry received the same amount of encouragement from the state and was forbidden to deal with foreigners; and the growth of trade was thus left dependent on increase of population by immigration and by the surplus of births over deaths. It has since then undergone some slight revision, both by the reduction of duties on some articles and the addition to the free list of articles from which practically no duties were received. But it still remains in the main a war-tariff, framed without any careful or effective preparation for the function of protection. As long as the great government expenditures lasted, and the currency continued to expand, and vast additions to the working capital of the country were made by foreign loans for railroads, its defects as a protective tariff were concealed from the public. When these stimuli were withdrawn, seven years after the war, it was found that the tariff did not protect—that is, it kept out foreign goods, but it did not keep native industry from languishing. No worse years of depression have been witnessed since 1837 than the six years following the panic of 1873. No branch of industry escaped. In fact, the failure of the tariff as an instrument of protection—*i.e.*, of support and encouragement—seemed so complete that the leading free-traders came forward in every direction to point to the condition of the country as a demonstration by experiment of the soundness of their position, and very few protectionists had the courage to gainsay them. No protectionist picture of the probable consequences of free-trade was more woful than that which the country actually presented after thirteen years' experience of as high a tariff as any protectionist called for. The iron manufacture, the cotton manufacture, and all their tributaries and dependencies were utterly prostrated. Capital lay idle in great masses in all the great cities, and the newspapers teemed with exhortations to the city population to go back to agriculture, in sheer hopelessness about the near future of manufactures and exchange. The revival which has since come about cannot have been due to the tariff, according to the received laws of thought, because the tariff was in operation when the depression came. It has doubtless been due to the increased stability of the currency; to the growth of population acting on the vast untouched resources opened up by the new railroads made before

the panic; to the extraordinary demands for agricultural produce created in Europe, partly by bad harvests in that region and partly by the increased and increasing cheapness with which improved means of transportation enable the American producer to supply European markets. We have thus had a demonstration that the tariff as it stands is not a defence against overwhelming commercial disaster, and that in fact it is not an efficient protective tariff, because the object of a protective tariff is not to prevent foreigners, as such, from selling in the home markets, but to make the home markets profitable for natives, no matter who sells in them.

It would seem to be a fair and plain enough deduction from all this that the tariff as it now stands is by no means a perfect instrument, and will bear considerable revision in the direction of providing a foreign market somewhere which will prevent the recurrence of the tremendous collapse of 1873-9. For that collapse there was apparently no cure but the general growth of the country. The home market having failed the American manufacturer he had no other in reserve to help him out of his difficulty, because the tariff as it had existed from 1861 had cut him off from all relations with foreign countries, civilized and barbarous, so completely that even American ships, like the Chinese junks, were confined to the coasting trade of their own country. There is already a large and increasing exportation of agricultural products to Europe, but the foreign market for American manufactures is still small. What there is so much talked of mainly because there was previously none at all, but it is undoubtedly capable of being fostered and enlarged by a readjustment of the tariff with reference to the cheap production of goods, rather than to the taxation of them simply. There is probably no industry of the world growing more rapidly than the carrying trade, owing to the opening up of the whole globe to traffic of one sort or another; but in this we have now no share whatever, except along our own coast, although there is capital and enterprise enough in the country to give the United States the second, if not the first, place in it. A revision of the tariff in the interest of real protection—that is, as an assistance to American citizens in getting much profit out of any lawful business—would give the United States this place very rapidly, but the only change in this direction as yet proposed by Republican politicians is the plan of having the Government pay people salaries for engaging in the shipping business. There is, indeed, no talk from that quarter on the stump of any possibility of improving the tariff in any way, or of revising it or adapting it to the new conditions of trade created by the changes of the last twenty years. Many industries are now willing to admit that they do not need so much protection; others have been proved to stand in no need of it at all; others, again, have shown they do not deserve it; others still are ready to show that with some slight shifting of the incidence of taxation they can flourish instead of languishing. But one gets no indication of this state of things from the Republican stump. Although it is only one year since the country arose from a deep and prolonged season of depression, the orators all talk as if nothing of the kind could occur under our present fiscal arrangements. The world changes rapidly, and has changed prodigiously since 1861, but they make little change in their wares, and offer us "the Solid South" and the tariff of 1861 as good old stand-bys which time cannot wither nor custom stale.

RUMANIA BETWEEN THE KAISERS AND THE CZAR.

A WEIGHTY rumor has got abroad, and confirmations of it are repeated, that at the recent princely and diplomatic meetings at Vienna, Ischl, and Friedrichsruhe an agreement was matured, under Bismarck's auspices, by which Rumania formally joins the alliance between the Emperors of Germany and Austria-Hungary, and is in return guaranteed integrity and independence, besides being raised to the dignity of a kingdom. Italy, too, is said to be ready to enter the alliance, having arranged with Austria their mutual external relations in regard to the territories of the Balkan Peninsula bordering on the Adriatic. Servia, wedged in between Rumania, Hungary, and Bosnia—which Austria now holds—must, voluntarily or not, place herself under the protectorate of the chief allies, and Russia is thus completely shut out from the Peninsula, as her only communications by land with the Slavic populations she has delivered are through Rumanian terri-

tory, and her connections through the Black Sea are highly precarious. If the reiterated statements are true, and Italy is to make the affair a quadruple alliance, this contrivance of Bismarck has more than one aspect, and its bearings will be gravely considered in Paris no less than in St. Petersburg. If only a triple alliance has been formed, or is being formed, the move is exclusively directed against Russia, yet its significance and importance are unusually great. It cannot fail to aggravate the tension already existing between the governments of the Czar and the allied Kaisers, and it can easily push matters in Eastern Europe to a violent crisis. The Polish question is looming up as another complication of incalculable gravity between Austria-Hungary, backed by Germany, on one side, and Russia on the other. In this article, however, only Rumania's position and probable or possible attitude will receive a cursory consideration.

Rumania, which consists of Moldavia, Wallachia, and the recently added Dobrudja, but to the chief component parts of which formerly also belonged Bukowina, annexed a century ago by Austria, and Bessarabia, taken by Russia in 1812, owes her deliverance from the Turkish yoke to the wars of the Czars against the Sultans, and her unity to the influence of the late Emperor of the French. The treaties of peace which Russian arms forced Turkey to conclude at Kainarji in 1774, at Jassy in 1792, at Bucharest in 1812, at Akerman in 1826, and at Adrianople in 1829, all secured autonomous rights to the Christian Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, and the last-named peace even deprived the former masters, the Turks, of the right of permanent abode in them. The same treaties, however, also gradually established a Russian protectorate over them; and that the policy of St. Petersburg contemplated deliverance and protection first and annexation to Russia next, nobody doubted at Jassy or Bucharest any more than at the Foreign Offices of Vienna, Paris, or London. Austrian and West-European diplomacy checked the efforts of the Czars to break up the Ottoman Empire, and Russian diplomacy and armed intervention, in their turn, stifled the repeated attempts of the Moldo-Wallachian patriots to achieve a union of the Principalities and constitutional liberty. The Hospodars were by turns tools and opponents of Russia. The people were grateful to the Czars for freeing them from Moslem oppression and Fanariote extortion, but feared and often felt their despotic rule, and, though Orthodox Greek Christians like the Russians, they trembled at the idea of being absorbed by the latter, with whom they had no national affinity, while both their Romanic blood and liberal aspirations made them turn their eyes toward France. Finally, Napoleon III., having humbled Russia at Sebastopol, and being as anxious to erect a Latin barrier against Slav predominance in the East as he afterwards showed himself to strengthen the Latin race against the Anglo-Saxon by creating the throne of Maximilian in Mexico, took up the cause of Rumanian union, and under his auspices the Principalities became formally united, as a semi-independent state, in 1861. Alexander Couza, however, who was the first Prince of Rumania, was driven from his throne by a revolution in February, 1866, and was succeeded by Charles of Hohenzollern, a protégé of Bismarck, to whose royal master he was related, and a brother of the prince whose candidature for the Spanish throne was in 1870 to drive Napoleon to his fatal declaration of war against Germany. Her complete independence Rumania purchased at the price of blood profusely shed in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, at the reduction of Plevna. That their timely aid rendered that reduction possible, and saved Czar Alexander from failure and disgrace, the Rumanians probably deem a full equivalent for the services rendered them by that monarch and his predecessors—not without selfish ulterior purposes—and they now undoubtedly feel morally free to choose friends and allies according to their own interests exclusively. Besides, they were, at the end of the war, badly wounded in their national pride, by being forced to cede to Russia that portion of Bessarabia which, by the Treaty of Paris in 1856, had been incorporated with Moldavia, and to accept as a compensation for that Rumanian district non-Rumanian Dobrudja.

Whether or not Rumania can, without a breach of gratitude, renounce her friendly relations with Russia and join an alliance purposefully formed against that Empire, she would undoubtedly—as nations generally act—heed only her own interests, if these were clear and uniformly appreciated by her statesmen and people. This is, however, far from being the case. The Rumanians are agitated by considerations

both of the future security and independence and of the future greatness of their country, and these considerations lead them politically in opposite directions. Their Principality of five million inhabitants, of whom nine-tenths are Rumanians, is now threatened in its integrity and independence only by the constantly-expanding Empire of the Czars, which, if it ever realizes its purpose or dream of uniting under its sceptre all the Slavs of Europe, including Bulgarians and Serbs, must necessarily, though perhaps involuntarily, crush and absorb Rumania, a Latin oasis in the midst of the Slavic world. The only empire which can save her from this fate, if the Pan-Slavic struggle is to rage, is the neighboring Austria-Hungary, whose leading nationalities, the German and Hungarian, are equally threatened by the Slavic expansion. What is more natural, then, for Rumania than to seek the powerful protection of allied Austria and Germany, and, until Russia's ambition is curbed, to form a bulwark of the non-Slavic world between the invaders and their natural friends and helpers, such as the Magyars form on their side of the Carpathians? This policy, however, demands the giving up by the Rumanians of their long-cherished expectation of some day—perhaps in a not remote future—founding a great "Dacian" realm, a main component part of which is to consist of Transylvania and the adjoining parts of Hungary proper, together inhabited by more than two million Rumanians. These provinces—such is the plan as long ago formed, and zealously urged, both in Bucharest and Moscow—are to be torn from the domains of the Hungarian crown by insurrection and invasion, with the aid of Russia. If successful, such a revolution would break up Austria-Hungary, destroy the Magyar nationality, establish Russia's Pan-Slavic reign, and leave her generous enough to tolerate the existence of an independent Dacian kingdom of eight millions. The execution, however, of this vast scheme must meet with immense obstacles, the principal of which are the backing of Austria-Hungary by Germany, the desperate resistance which the Magyars will offer to attempts on their national existence, their known bravery, and the stupendous rampart of the Carpathians which encircles their kingdom and fatally separates the Rumanians of Transylvania from their brethren in Rumania—just as the Pyrenees separate the Basques of France from their brethren in the Basque Provinces of Spain. To attain security from a peril which may any day become imminent, Rumania must rely upon Russia's natural enemy, Austria; to win the prize of greatness at some future day she must become the tool of Russia against her own natural protector. Regard for safety points one way, national ambition points the other. Each policy has its zealous adherents in the Principality. There is a Russian and there is an anti-Russian party, as there have always been, though under banners and with aims different from those of the present.

Between the supporters of the two diametrically opposite tendencies stand men of a third party, the party of neutrality. Correctly appreciating the position of Rumania, between the great Slavic empire in the East and the Germanic powers of Central Europe, to be perfectly analogous to the position of Belgium between France and Germany, and considering at what immense price of blood and virtual dependence their nation must buy security on the one side or additional acquisitions on the other, if it is to share in the great strife to come, they see the only rational course in a consistent and firm neutrality, like Belgium's. Such an attitude, even if not secured by treaties, might serve to prevent the storm from passing over Rumania; if too feeble to oppose, it would still allow her to re-erect herself after it had passed and live in peace with the victors. Though too weak for self-aggrandizement, she could become prosperous and influential through commerce and agriculture, as Belgium has become through industry. And as for Transylvania, there are still the varying chances of the future. Wars and revolutions might, without Rumania's initiative and peril, throw it into her lap, if the laws of geography permit it. This is the counsel of moderate men, and such counsels, whether the wisest or not, one would have expected to prevail with Prince Charles's Government. It was hardly presumable that he would adopt the revolutionary schemes of the Chauvinists of Moscow and Bucharest, and cast in his lot among the fanatical foes of his own nation for the sake of a distant object which may prove to be entirely visionary; but neither could his influence have been deemed strong enough to give a direction to the popular will completely at variance with its national and religious prejudices, leanings,

and aspirations, however conformable to far-seeing statesmanship and the dictates of the present arbiter of Europe's destinies, Prince Bismarck. If Prince Charles has, in fact, persuaded his Cabinet and people to follow him definitely in the latter direction, his personal abilities and statecraft must have been greatly underrated, and a great movement has taken place on the diplomatic chess-board of Europe, the importance of which may speedily develop itself—outside of Rumania, which will merely rise in rank.

ENGLISH JOURNALISM.—V.

THE DAILY TELEGRAPH.

LONDON, August, 1880.

THE *Daily Telegraph* in 1880 will complete the twenty-fifth year of its existence. It is, with one exception, the youngest of all the London morning newspapers. Its growth has been rapid, and its success, as a commercial enterprise at least, is without parallel since the period at which the *Times* became the leading journal of Europe and of the world. Like its older contemporary, the *Daily Telegraph* made a false start and had a ricketty infancy, in which extinction seemed more than once probable. Its originator was a certain Colonel Sleigh, one of those military men who for some mysterious reason exchange soldiering for literary and commercial adventures, in which they often lay the foundations of enterprises upon which more fortunate speculators build a large and substantial superstructure of success. The *Daily Telegraph* was set on foot by Colonel Sleigh in 1855, under the title of the *Daily Telegraph and Courier*. Colonel Sleigh was almost always borrowing money when he was not spending it, and among his creditors there happened to be at a certain time Mr. Joseph Moses Levi, a printer and the proprietor of a Sunday newspaper, which still exists, oddly enough devoted, like most Sunday newspapers, to sporting and to theatricals, and known by the name of the *Sunday Times*. Colonel Sleigh's debts were usually bad debts, and in discharge of one of them he made to Mr. Levi what would then be considered the bad payment of the *Daily Telegraph and Courier*. The paper in its new hands underwent many vicissitudes, and was more than once in danger of coming to a stop for want of resources. But the difficulties were tided over, creditors were paid as Mr. Levi had been paid by Colonel Sleigh, by means of shares in the paper, and found themselves in the course of a few years deriving incomes which it is a mistake to call princely, but which many princes would willingly exchange for their own revenues.

The *Daily Telegraph* was started as a twopenny paper, but Mr. Levi had the sagacity to reduce its price to a penny. Its present position is to be attributed entirely to the sagacity and energy of a single family. The journalistic faculty which Mr. Joseph Moses Levi possessed was simply the faculty of business management, but it was what modern art critics would call supreme, and it has been handed down with the addition of considerable literary perception to his son, Mr. Edward Levi Lawson, who is now the editor and manager of the *Daily Telegraph*. Mr. Lawson and his predecessor and associates in the conduct of the *Daily Telegraph* afford the most striking English illustration of a phenomenon common enough in Europe, and probably in America, too, of Jewish ascendancy in all the arts in which success depends upon the skilful management of men and manipulation of opinion. Mr. Lawson is to journalism in England what Lord Beaconsfield is to statesmanship, what the Rothschilds are to finance, and what the late Lady Waldegrave (the daughter, as it may be remembered, of the Jewish singer Braham—originally Abraham, shortened) was to society. "The snub-nosed Franks," as Lord Beaconsfield has called the English people, are no match for their Oriental rivals in those arts of which journalism is one. The Orontes did not flow with a stronger current into the Tiber than the Jordan has flowed into the Thames. The subtle and sympathetic, and yet not sensitive, Hebrew character enables it to throw itself with promptitude and with completeness of transformation, or at any rate with consummate dramatic art of impersonation, into the moods of the people among whom the chosen race finds itself. The Jews in England, in France, and in Germany are more English, French, and German than the English, French, and Germans themselves. They exaggerate, as actors on the stage do, the passions and the purposes which they simulate, and the extravagances of art are more potent in their appeal to the public feeling than the modesty of nature would be. The *Daily Telegraph*, which was not Liberal, but simply Gladstonean, under Mr. Gladstone's administration, was not Conservative, but simply Disraelite, under Lord Beaconsfield's. It casts itself into the current of personal and popular feeling which may be flowing most strongly for the moment, and it has done so with a success which has never been surpassed in the records of journalistic pliancy since the earliest triumphs of the *Times* were won.

But the success of the *Daily Telegraph* has not been due solely or even principally to its political tactics. To it belongs the distinction of having enlarged, legitimately or otherwise, the sphere of journalism. It included in its descriptive articles and in its social leaders a range of topics which were

thought to be below the level of newspaper cognizance. The old absurdity about the dignity of history, which Macaulay and Carlyle, in England, and Michelet, in France, exploded both by precept and by example, had its counterpart in journalism. As historians thought it would be a disparagement to their vocation to describe anything below the lives and deaths and actions of kings, the debates and councils and the wars of nations, so newspapers, being of the high-and-dry order, used to confine themselves to solemn leading articles upon political topics, to reports of proceedings in Parliament and in law-courts, and to foreign correspondence dealing with topics abroad as topics at home were dealt with. A school of historians arose which found in the daily life of the people, in their sufferings and amusements and vicissitudes, a worthier theme than in the formal records of the fortunes of kings and the rise and fall of statesmen. The *Daily Telegraph* did more than any other newspaper to effect a similar development in journalism. It was the business of the stage in Shakspeare's time, or at any rate in Shakspeare's conception, to hold the mirror up to nature. It is now the business of the newspapers to hold the mirror up to the world and to society. Their material, like the farrago of Juvenal's book, consists of everything that men do. Descriptions of the people in their homes and taking their pleasure, sketches of low life and high life, pictures of men in their several abodes and pursuits, of the crowds which fill the streets or the solitude of rural life, of trades and professions, of churches and theatres, of royal ceremonies and the people who frequent them, of military reviews and popular tea-gardens, public rejoicings and public executions, of eminent men and notorious criminals—these are but a fragment of the subjects and illustrative examples of the topics with which daily newspapers, following in the main the example of the *Daily Telegraph*, now deal. It cannot be doubted that the change is immensely for the better. The future historian, if we are to take account of a person who may perhaps be very well left to take care of himself, will find a great deal more for his purpose in the columns of the modern and cheaper press than in those of journals of the older and severer type. Even the descriptions of eminent persons, the accounts which are given of the dress which statesmen wear, the gestures which they use, the attitudes in which they sit, the incidents which give meaning to the dryness of ordinary parliamentary reporting, possess a value which only stupid pedantry will disparage. Mr. Carlyle would give anything to know as much of the manners and appearance, the clothes even, and the daily ways, of the subjects of his history and biography as the descriptive reporter tells the morning newspaper reader of Lord Beaconsfield or Mr. Gladstone. The images by which the distinguished men of former days lived before us are made up mainly of these despised details. The slender figure and stooping attitude of Tiberius, the blotches and the plasters which disfigured his face, were elements in the image of that mysterious character of which Tacitus did not disdain to avail himself. He used them without sneering, as our superfine lovers of the dry bones of contemporary history are prone to do, at the contemporary observers who supplied them. This is merely an illustration, to which it would be easy to add others. It shows that modern journalism in what are thought to be its excesses and extravagances of personal and social description is simply erring, if it errs at all, in the way in which the greatest historians of the past and present have erred, and in which the historians of the future will be grateful for the opportunity of erring.

Of course when a new feature or principle is introduced into journalism, or anything else, it is apt to be pushed to excess, and descriptive reporting has no doubt been occasionally, and it may even be said habitually, overdone in the *Daily Telegraph*. There has been often too much of a disposition to hold up to vice its own image, and to take it for granted that things which are necessarily done may therefore be fittingly described. The mirror which is held up to nature and to the world ought to be a discriminating mirror. There are things which it should decline to reflect; and the line has not always been correctly drawn. But the *Daily Telegraph*, it must be admitted, commenced a healthy reformation. In regard to society and to politics it was, as compared with the older form of journalism, what a naturalist of the fields and of the woods is to the naturalist of books merely and scientific memoirs. It brought itself into close relations with statesmen and political leaders at home; its correspondents found their way into courts and ministerial ante-chambers abroad, and dealt directly with foreign rulers and politicians. The intimate relations which during the Second Empire existed between the late Mr. Whitehurst, who was the resident correspondent of the *Telegraph* in Paris, and the court of Napoleon III. are an example of the tactics which the *Daily Telegraph*, in its dealings with great persons at home and abroad, has pursued with some success and with some rebuffs and failures, but on the whole with a decided advantage to itself and to its readers.

The newspaper genius of Mr. Levi and Mr. Lawson has been shown in an eminent degree in their selection of the persons to whom they have confided political and literary work on their journal. Probably the writer to whom the *Daily Telegraph* owes as much as any other is Mr. Edwin Arnold, a gentleman from whom have proceeded most of those extravagances of phrase and of sentiment which have gained for it the admiration of tens of thousands

of readers and the scorn of a handful of critics. Mr. Arnold adds the experience of a traveller to whom the East and Europe are alike familiar, respectable scholarship of the Oxford type, and the imagination and eloquence of a rhetorician who is almost a poet. It is he who has sung in dithyrambic strains of sincere and passionate though fleeting conviction the praises now of Mr. Gladstone and now of Lord Beaconsfield. It was he who, Mænad-like, flung the torches of a fiery Jingoism, and performed the wild dances of an almost demoniac inspiration, during the crisis and agony of the Eastern Question. But Mr. Arnold is capable of writing quietly and gracefully upon subjects which touch the home-life of the English people, and even, it is said, of illustrating scientific discoveries with a graphic and almost poetic pen.

Next to Mr. Arnold, and perhaps some would say even more than to Mr. Arnold, the *Telegraph* owes its popularity to the leading articles of Mr. George Augustus Sala, who discourses in its columns of everything under the sun, and contributes from a copiously-stored memory and commonplace-book facts and fancies, anecdote and learning, to throw light upon the incidents and whimsicalities of the day. Perhaps, however, Mr. Sala's brilliant style, his remarkable powers of observation, of description, and that penetrating good sense which is the real basis of all these exterior gifts, are more conspicuously shown in the letters which he has written to the *Telegraph* in and from almost all nations of the Old World and the New. Mr. W. H. Russell, whose reputation is more closely associated with the *Times* than with the *Daily Telegraph*, is a newly-gained recruit to the latter journal, who brings to it something more than the fame of past performances. Among the political writers for the *Daily Telegraph* mention must be made of Mr. George Hooper, a civilian whose writings on military history possess a strategical and tactical value which military critics have been the first to acknowledge. Like Cassio, and like a good many closet-soldiers, Mr. Hooper knows only the "bookish theoretic" of the art of warfare, but then his acquaintance with it is probably greater than that which many professors in military colleges can boast. The editor of the *Globe* in its better and Palmerstonian period, Mr. Hooper adds large political knowledge to his more special acquirements in military art. Another of the leader-writers for the *Daily Telegraph* is Mr. Wilson—the Wilsons swarm on the London press—who divides the labors of the Gallery leader-writer with Mr. Hooper. Other writers of leading and descriptive articles are Mr. Phil. Robinson (the author of 'Our Indian Garden'); Mr. Drew Gay, lately its correspondent in the East; Mr. Godfrey Turnor; and Mr. Clement, who is its dramatic critic. The musical critic of the *Daily Telegraph* is Mr. Joseph Barnett. Nor ought the name of the Hon. Frank Lawley to be omitted, an accomplished writer, sportsman, and man of business, who began as private secretary to Mr. Gladstone during his earlier Chancellorship of the Exchequer.

ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT'S LETTERS TO HIS BROTHER WILLIAM.

BERLIN, August, 1880.

YOU will probably remember the great sensation which, twenty years ago, was created by the publication of the correspondence between Alexander von Humboldt and Varnhagen von Ense. Full of interesting gossip, rich in slanders of persons in high life, independent in its sovereign critique, and attractively interwoven with important questions of a scientific character, the book could not fail to be translated into almost all modern languages and to find hundreds of thousands of eager readers. A young and enterprising firm of your city, Messrs. Rudd & Carleton, in spite of a London translation, published a translation of their own. While engaged in his work their translator received repeated calls from prominent New York gentlemen, historians, poets, and travellers, who were eager to learn whether Humboldt had really made disparaging statements about their personal characters and their writings. Grim old Count Gurowski had repeated over and over again, in some of the New York clubs, that Humboldt had exposed the utter hollowness of several American authors. Of course, not a word of Gurowski's insinuations was true, but the excitement caused by them was great.

Comical as this incident in New York may have been, the book produced a very deplorable effect in Berlin. The then Prince Regent, the present King and Emperor William, was just about to sign a decree directing the purchase by the Prussian Government of all the property, including books, collections, and manuscripts, of Humboldt, in order to keep it in its old place in the Oranienburger Strasse, in Berlin, and to make it the nucleus of a great natural museum, to be called the "Humboldt Museum." Just at this moment the correspondence with Varnhagen was published, and a courtier hinted to the Prince that Humboldt had very disrespectfully made mention of him, several times alluding to him as a very insignificant, if not stupid, drill-sergeant, who was entirely unqualified for his high position. Upon this information the Prince did not sign the decree, and the Humboldt estate was sold under the hammer. It would, of course, have been much better if the Varnhagen correspondence had never been published, the more so as its literary value is not at all extraordinary.

The present collection ('Briefe Alexanders von Humboldt an seinen Bruder Wilhelm, herausgegeben von der Familie von Humboldt in Ottmachau: Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung. 1880') is of a far greater calibre; but, as it gives little or no personal gossip, it has been less noticed than its predecessor of 1860, to which, nevertheless, it is in every respect superior. It thus meets with the fate of former valuable and more discreet publications, containing Humboldt's letters, such as: Correspondence and Conversations of Alexander von Humboldt with a Young Friend (Friedrich Althaus), 1871; Correspondence with Berghaus (1863); Letters to Pictet, in the eighth volume of *Le Globe* (1868); Scientific and Literary Correspondence published by De la Roquette (1869); Letters to Bunsen (1869); Correspondence with Count Cancrin (1869); Letters to Friedrich von Raumer (1869); Correspondence with Goethe (1876), with J. H. Campe (1877), and with Gauss (1877). While all the letters of William von Humboldt to Alexander are missing, and are supposed to have been destroyed by the latter, Alexander's letters number not more than sixty-three, and, written partly in German, partly in French, begin with Puerto de Orotava, June 20, 1799, while the last is dated St. Petersburg, December 9, 1829. These thirty years thus cover Alexander's American travels, his residence in Paris, and his last great journey, which, at the request of the Russian Emperor, he undertook to the Ural. They contain nothing new on natural science or historical events, to which they only here and there allude. It seems as if in 1822 William's wife, Caroline, *née* Dachroeden, had complained of this sterility, but Alexander answered that they could not be too careful, and that, instead of dilating upon the great convulsions of the world, they had better confine themselves to their personal affairs and family talk, as all their letters, even those which were forwarded by royal couriers, were repeatedly opened by order of the distrustful governments.

Humboldt does not think it worth while to characterize a single one of the diplomatists of the Congress of Verona, where, by the special invitation of the King of Prussia, he occupied a position equal to that of the most prominent participants. Only here and there he expresses his disgust at the royalty of the time, which he had ample opportunity of observing closely. He feels tired of that shallow society, and whenever he mentions men and things he speaks of them with utter disdain.

"I have just returned from the gardens of Giusti," he writes, October 31, 1822, "where we were alone with all the sovereigns to receive the King and Queen of Sardinia. These solemn entrances of the monarchs between a hedge of bayonets are the only spectacles which the Congress offers. In all other respects I feel perfectly at home, and live in noble retirement. In the evening the diplomatists gather at the Princess Lieven's, who wishes me to inform you that she daily deplores your absence in London. I often go there late in the evening. Prince Metternich is a friend of this society. I have learned there how to make macaroni, how the lazzaroni get rid of their vermin, and other things equally instructive."

Humboldt longed to breathe in a purer atmosphere, and to rejoin his brother. "What a moral excitement," he laments, December 10, 1822, "have been these last three months. The mosquitoes of the Cassiquiare did not trouble me as much." Of only one man, whom he had met accidentally in the Tyrolean mountains, does he give a quite amusing sketch. It was the celebrated German geologist, his friend Leopold von Buch. He thus writes, October 11, 1822, to William:

"I have been seen by Leopold von Buch, who, armed with umbrella, cloak, and a whole library of books in his pockets, has been wandering for five months on foot and without a guide amongst the mountains of Tyrol. He did not recognize me sufficiently to stop my carriage, but followed me to Verona, where I spent five days with him in the most interesting mineralogical conversation. I have shown him a part of my essay on geognosy, which is printed but not yet published, and have had the satisfaction of seeing that he is very much pleased with it. I left again immediately to make a tour afoot with him in the surroundings of Verona, to the basalt valleys of San Giovanni and Ronca, viz., Stanghelini, Monte Bocca, where the basalt has killed the fishes in the caves of San Ambrogio. Von Buch, undoubtedly one of the first geognosts of our century, will always be a remarkable psychological phenomenon. It is scarcely possible to unite greater oddity with so much genius and nobility of character. The voluntary isolation in which he has always lived has so increased his love of independence and his nervous irritability that the mere thought of taking a guide enrages him. I have patiently marched hours with him; he consults his map; we do not find a village where to spend the night; it is raining heavily; we meet a vine-dresser; you immediately become the most detestable man in his eyes if you dare to enquire the way, or show any disquietude about the route selected. He is fifty years old, and walks fourteen hours daily. 'Talking continually' fatigues him most, as he says. He is all alone, and speaks very loud. He argues on mineralogy with his antagonists (and has the mania to believe that his merits are not appreciated). He argues alone, and this exhausts him. Sometimes he stops walking, rubs his hands together with increasing rapidity, lifts them towards the sun, and, with half-opened mouth, his spectacles on his nose, and head thrown back, 'enjoys the sun of Italy.' He always has a fixed idea, to which he incessantly recurs; but while gazing on the granite and euphotides he, nevertheless, likes to repeat the tales which his brother (the court marshal) relates about the adventures of the ladies of the late queen. He is

par métier an aristocrat and ultra, and the small red ribbon, of which he often thinks in the midst of his enjoyment of nature, gives him a pleasure which is not at all philosophical."

In spite of all this, Leopold von Buch was to Humboldt, as he wrote Varnhagen von Ense on being informed of his death (1853), one of the few men of a distinct individuality ("Einer der wenigen Menschen die eine Physiognomie haben").

If a further proof had been required that the cruel policy of the Holy Alliance was repugnant to Humboldt's feelings, and that it made him even think of emigrating to America, it is furnished by a plan the details of which, a week later, he laid before his brother. It is, in my opinion, for your readers the most interesting letter of the whole collection, and reads as follows:

"I have a great plan of calling into life, in the city of Mexico, a central scientific society for all those parts of America which have become independent. The Emperor of Mexico, whom I know personally, is going to be de-throned; there will be a republican government, and I have decided to end my days in the most agreeable and useful manner for science, in a part of the world where I am extremely cherished, and where everything seems to promise me a happy existence. It is the best way of not dying without glory—uniting around one's self many learned men, and enjoying that independence of opinion and sentiment which is necessary to my happiness. This project of founding a society in Mexico for the purpose of exploring more than nineteen-twentieths of the country, which I have not yet seen (the volcanoes of Guatemala and the Isthmus), does not exclude a trip to the Philippines and Bengal. It is quite a short excursion, and probably the Philippine Islands and Cuba will form independent states and confederate with Mexico. In France four or five million francs are being collected to reorganize the working of the Mexican mines. I shall have no responsibility whatever in this great monetary affair, but it will be very useful to me, for all the most distinguished and scientific men who, like me, wish to leave Europe, are to be employed by those who advance the funds, and who will gladly follow all the advice I may give them. For this society, which the Mexicans wish so ardently, I count on Kunth's and Valenciennes's assistance. By this voyage I could enrich the museums of the King immensely, the zoology of Mexico being quite unknown here. How many plants could be introduced into our forests and cultivated in the open air! Perhaps you will laugh at the ardor with which I cling to this American project, but when one has no family and no children to care for, one must think of embellishing one's old age."

So, not for a short time, not for a few years, but for ever, Humboldt intended to leave Europe. What his brother thought about his "great plan" does not appear from the letters; but he probably did not disapprove of it, for, two months later, in a letter dated December 17, 1822, Alexander makes remarks about the Incas, especially about their language, and then continues: "About all these matters I shall make the closest researches, as soon as I shall have established my great society in the Spanish Colonies, and as soon as a lively correspondence between Buenos Ayres, Chili, and California arises." Not until the year 1824 was "the great plan" definitively abandoned, but only because in a country continually disturbed by revolutions there was no longer any prospect of carrying it out according to Humboldt's intentions.

The last nineteen letters of the volume were written in Russia, from April to December, 1829. Humboldt, who, in 1827, at the request of the King of Prussia, returned to Berlin, where henceforth he remained until his death, extended his Russian scientific explorations to Siberia. He was received everywhere with marks of the greatest distinction; but this extraordinary welcome tendered to him by all classes of society annoyed him much, and prevented him from following more closely his observations. "The noble hospitality of the Russians," he writes to William, "the throng of curious admirers, and the constant necessity of being presented, of answering and making addresses, deprive me, in a great measure, of a real enjoyment of people and country. I long for free air far away from the cities. These eternal introductions—a very hard necessity of my position—are very tiresome. In Petersburg, from eight o'clock in the morning till late at night, I have been driven from house to house."

While on this tour he was informed by his brother William that the King of Prussia intended to make him (Alexander) director of the Berlin Museum. The mere idea of such a plan excited the traveller to the utmost.

"Is it possible," he answers, "that you can really imagine me the director of a museum? Your words, 'I apprehend that you cannot well decline that office,' frightened me and deprived me of last night's sleep. Have I given up my residence in Paris and returned to my fatherland to become director of a picture-gallery, to busy myself with things which are diametrically opposed to all that has given me some reputation in the world? I would rather leave my country again than to submit to such a humiliation. I shall neither accept this position, nor the presidency of a permanent commission, nor any other office. Tell the King that I am at his command in everything that is only temporary. Even if my appointment should be published in the official paper, and if this commission should be endowed with the most extraordinary privileges, I nevertheless should flatly refuse, and request you everywhere, in my name, to declare this to be my resolution."

Those to whom outward appearances and a rich income are the most desirable objects in life will probably laugh at the fear of the great scholar, the more so as the office was expressly to be created as a kind of sinecure for Humboldt. In order better to appreciate this blunt refusal one must bear in mind that he had spent his whole fortune on his travels and on his costly description of them, and that he was often in great need of money. But far above a brilliant position in the eyes of the world he valued his personal independence—i. e., the freedom of his time and of his intellectual powers, and the right to dispose of them according to his own judgment. It strikes me that just this part of the correspondence would be excellent reading matter for your politicians during and immediately after the present Presidential campaign.

On the whole, these letters of Alexander von Humboldt form a very important contribution to a clearer understanding of his character, and should be read wherever his writings have become household works. Besides, they are eloquent witnesses of the harmony of the personal feeling as well as the literary lore of the two brothers, and furnish an extraordinary instance of noble love and friendship, in which the sacredness of nature was steadily intensified by the affection and devotedness of genius and sentiment. ??

Correspondence.

THE ALABAMA CENSUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: My attention is called to a charge in the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*, upon the alleged authority of J. P. Southworth, Esq., former United States District-Attorney for the Southern District of Alabama, but now of New Orleans, La., to the effect that the census of Alabama and Louisiana had been "swelled twenty-five per cent." The gentleman in question is well acquainted, personally, with the supervisor of the census in this district. If he had any evidence to sustain his charges, I can only express my surprise that he did not in some way bring the same to that supervisor's notice. That, up to this day, he has failed to do this, is proof either that he has no evidence or that the *Inter-Ocean* misrepresented him.

If such a statement has been made, I do not hesitate to pronounce it without foundation in facts, so far as applied to the Third Alabama District, comprising the counties of Baldwin, Choctaw, Clarke, Dallas, Greene, Marengo, Mobile, Monroe, Sumter, Washington, and Wilcox. I venture to add, from my knowledge of the practice in appointing the census enumerators, that all these stories of fraud in the census enumeration in Southern States are simply incredible. In this district the one hundred and seventy-five enumerators were selected out of fully double the number of applicants. Their names, together with the respective applications of each, executed in his own handwriting, and stating the principal facts of his education, public positions then or formerly held, and present occupation, were forwarded to the Superintendent at Washington for approval. No person knew the result of his application until he received, through the mails, a blank form of oath and his commission. Except in two cases in Mobile County, no one in this district received his commission and oath before the 20th of May. Before that date no enumerator knew who his co-laborers would be, even in his own county, and after that date he only learned by hearsay, having no information from this office.

Any one acquainted with the difficulties of correspondence by mail in interior Southern districts, and with the general immobility of the population therein, can easily estimate the probability that these one hundred and seventy-five enumerators became acquainted with the fact of each other's appointments, and reached a common understanding to deliberately make false enumerations, between the 20th of May and 1st of June. After the latter date they were in the field, moving from farm to farm, and distant from post-offices. It is simply incredible that even the dozen enumerators of any one county could have had an understanding to make fraudulent returns. If wrongs were committed, they must have been the result of individual crime in each case, and free from every element of a conspiracy.

From my personal knowledge of the appointees in this district I feel that I can safely assert that the charge of swelling the census made against them is absolutely false, and challenge the production of any evidence to support it. Therefore I also said, at the outset, that, from my practical acquaintance with the methods of the Census Bureau, I am led to believe that all similar charges against other Southern census districts are equally baseless with those made against the Alabama districts.—Very respectfully,

FREDERICK G. BROMBERG,
Supervisor.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISOR FOR THIRD ALABAMA DISTRICT,
MOBILE, ALA., Sept. 6, 1880.

SUPPOSED REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF THE "REPUBLICAN EMISSARY" FROM THE NORTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: At a supposed meeting in Tallahassee, Florida, the following supposed rejoinder was made to the supposed speech of a Republican emissary (see the *Nation* of Sept. 2):

"My Democratic friends: I am gratified at the attention and respectful hearing which you have given to the gentleman, sent out from the North by the Republican National Committee, who has just now taken his seat. A hearing equally attentive and respectful, let me assure him, he will receive whenever and wherever, during the present political campaign, he may ask it from the Democrats of Florida. But neither he nor you will fail to note that, while the white portion (nearly all Democrats) of the assemblage have thus listened to him, I no sooner rise to reply than all his colored Republican auditors, under the counsels of their white leaders, publicly given in this city a few weeks since, *to listen to no Democratic speaker*, have taken their departure.

"One other preliminary remark, due to us, due to our visitor: he is mistaken in saying he comes among us an 'odious and suspected person because wearing the name Republican.' No Republican coming here from the North is either suspected or odious because of his party name. We know too well the wealth, worth, patriotism, and intelligence of the great body of the Republican party of the North to entertain any such suspicion. In my political addresses to the people of Florida I have again and again done full justice to the Republicans of the New England and other Northern States by showing that there was nothing in common between them and the mongrel crew of varied political antecedents and nationalities who, flocking here like foul harpies for our spoliation, had disgraced the name of the party of Lincoln, Adams, Andrew, Seward, and Trumbull; asserting, in all places and on all occasions, that these creatures while plundering the South had dishonored the North.

"He does us only justice in conceding that none of us desires the re-establishment of slavery. For myself, I go further and assert that, instead of regretting that slavery went down with our short-lived Confederacy, in the first agony of my disappointment the abolition of slavery was the *one* thing that reconciled me to our fate. Many things have since combined to do it. But more than this I will say, and our friend, I hope, will repeat it when he returns North, as the matter seems to be causing some anxiety in the minds of Mr. Sherman and others there: we take not the least stock in any scheme for the payment of Southern war-claims. And, as for the payment for our slaves, while the three or four hundred thousand ex-slaveholders might not object, yet any proposition to that end, submitted to the white people of the South alone, would be voted down by an overwhelming majority. The only form having any claim to popular favor in which the proposition has been presented was that of a Republican candidate for Congress in one of the Southern States where negro voters were numerous, whose plan was to have the United States pay for the slaves, *the money to be equally divided between the emancipated blacks and their former owners!* The cunning aspirant was elected, but I believe never introduced into Congress his bill, and on the expiration of his term did not offer for re-election.

"I am sorry to have to tell him, I need not tell *you*, that our visitor's brilliant picture of Southern prosperity is greatly overcolored. Florida is, I suppose, doing as well as her Southern sisters, and yet Florida shows a loss of 60 per cent. of taxable values as compared with 1860, and a large per cent. since 1867. True, the entire cotton crop of the South has increased in the twenty years from 1860 to 1880 about 20 per cent., but the increase for the preceding twenty years, say 1840 to 1860, was 100 per cent. But be our present prosperity what it may, it must be remembered that none of these States has been for four years, most of them not for six, under Republican rule. What is saved from the wreck we enjoy not through but in spite of that party, as known here. When it is considered that the losses suffered by the South from the carpet-bag and negro governments are estimated (and I take the figures as given by an able and impartial Northern authority) at two hundred and fifty millions of dollars, it is not strange that Southern prosperity, even under home rule, is of slow revival.

"But our visitor tells us 'if we had promptly accepted the *inevitable*—the negro as a citizen with a vote—the friction, bitterness, and hardships [of reconstruction] would have been vastly diminished.' Perhaps so. If our *fore-sights* were as good as our *hind-sights* it would save us a great deal of trouble in other fields than politics. But how were we to know that suffrage for the negro, wholly uneducated as he came out of slavery, was one of the *inevitables* which the Republican politicians of the North had in store for us? We did know that in several Republican Northern States, where he had long enjoyed the advantages of public schools, and where his weakness in numbers as compared with the whites would make him, in any event, as a voter absolutely harmless, the ballot was withheld from him. We knew that Gen. Grant had asserted that to put it in his hands in the South would be disastrous; while

Senator Morton was on record to the same effect. The late lamented Mr. Greeley's panacea for our ills was not universal amnesty and universal suffrage, but universal amnesty and impartial suffrage. And I concede that if Congress in its reconstruction acts had granted the former it would have been wise in the South to have conceded the latter, fixing, however, as in most of the Republican States of the North, an educational qualification for all voters, whites and blacks.

"Could we reasonably have supposed that the Republican politicians would have been so remorselessly vindictive as to inflict upon us such a punishment (in the consequences of which the whole nation must share) as to commit the government of more than a third of the Union to the voting power of absolute ignorance? Why should they do this? Was their purpose the preservation of order and the protection of persons and property? This could have been done with infinitely less loss to us by holding these States as conquered provinces until by schools, established and maintained at public expense, the negro could have been educated up to the duties of a citizen. If, on the other hand, their purpose was to make Republican States in the South, nothing would have been easier in the then general odium in which the Democratic party was held here, without disfranchising anybody, if the Republican leaders could have conquered their prejudices and shown as politicians, not to say statesmen, a very small modicum of practical wisdom. If they had made their appeals to the leaders and members of the old Whig party, the supporters of Bell and Everett in 1860, and to the minority in the South who had remained true to the Union all through the war; had given them the Federal offices which might reasonably have gone to one-third of the States—judgeships, cabinet places, foreign missions, appointments as collectors, postmasters, and the rest—the result would have been the making of most of these States as steadfast in Republicanism as Massachusetts or Vermont. I say this most confidently and disinterestedly, as my antecedents would have fixed me with the minority of *outs*, not with the majority of *ins*.

"I am aware that there is a prevalent opinion North that we might have saved ourselves from the disastrous consequences of the Reconstruction Acts by actively participating in the early elections thereunder; instead of which, it is supposed, we sullenly and sulkily stood aloof, leaving things to take their course. I assure our visitor that nothing is further from the truth. A large number of us at the first of these elections (1868) were disfranchised—could not vote, could only work and talk. This we did, and, running a popular ticket for governor and Congressman (Florida was entitled then to but one representative to Congress), and the Republicans, carpet-baggers, and negroes being divided into the support of two tickets of nearly equal strength, the Conservatives (as we called ourselves, to escape the odium of the Democratic name) undoubtedly polled a plurality of votes—all that was necessary to elect. But the other party, or, rather, one wing of it, did the counting, and counted in its own men, all carpet-baggers—Read, of Wisconsin, as governor; Gleason, of Wisconsin, as lieutenant-governor; Hamilton, of Pennsylvania, as Congressman. At the next election (1870) of Congressman, lieutenant-governor, and legislature, all political disqualifications having ceased, we again carried the State, electing lieutenant-governor, Congressman, and a majority of the legislature. Again the other side did the counting, reversing the popular verdict. As regards the legislature there was no remedy. Our lieutenant-governor elect appealed to the Supreme Court, our Congressional candidate to the House of Representatives at Washington; and though the court was Republican and the Congress Republican, each of these tribunals was compelled by the facts to decide in favor of the Democratic contestant. These facts our friend, if he is curious in the matter, will find in volume xiii. Florida Supreme Court Reports, in a case reported under the title of *State ex rel. Bloxham vs. Board State Canvassers*. The facts, I say, are to be found in the report of that case; though it is also true that, with characteristic rascality, after the court had ruled the principles which gave Bloxham the office, the Republican leaders, to defeat the ends of justice, by changing the State Canvassing Board gave the court an excuse for not pronouncing, in that case, a final judgment in his favor. So that his lawyers had to begin again, not by *mandamus*, whose proceedings are expeditious, but by the dilatory action of *quo warranto*, in which, after the lapse of some eighteen months, he obtained a judgment of *ouster* against his usurping opponent. The Congressional case was that of *Niblack vs. Walls*, decided in favor of the former—only, however, a few days before the expiration of the term for which he was chosen.

"And so the voting went on at every election, State and national (save, perhaps, the Greeley fiasco), the Democrats doing the electing, the Republicans the counting, up to and including the memorable contest of 1876. Once more the Democrats elected their candidates—governor, Congressmen (now two), Presidential electors, and a majority of the legislature; once more their candidates—governor and Presidential electors—manifestly chosen, were counted out by our model Returning Board, braced and backed up by ex-Governor Noyes, now minister to France; General Lew Wallace, now Governor of New Mexico; John A. Kasson, now minister to Austria—but

not, I am gratified to say, by General Barlow, ex-attorney-general of New York, who *did not*, while the others *did*, get office from Mr. Hayes. The claims of the Democratic candidate for governor were, as in the previous case of their lieutenant-governor, taken before the State Supreme Court, two of the three members of which were Republicans, who, under the rulings already made in the Bloxham case, compelled the Canvassing Board to reverse their action. The result was the inauguration of the governor whom the people had elected. Not so, however, fared the Tilden electors. The Eight-to-Seven Commission, Mr. Garfield one of the Eight, shut its eyes to the fraud perpetrated by the Canvassing Board, and declared four men whom the people of Florida had not chosen Florida's Presidential electors. From this brief review it will be seen with how little justice our people can be charged with standing aloof in the political contests of the Reconstruction period. It is rather a matter of surprise the persistence with which they repeated, year after year, the struggle at the polls, with the chances all in favor of the popular verdict being nullified by a fraudulent count.

"But our visitor would have us forget the past. *How can we?* The record of its wrongs is burnt into our souls. We can't if we would, we ought not if we could forget them. We must remember them, not to avenge, but to guard against their repetition. I concede that he is right in saying that the Republicans of the North, for whom he speaks, 'do not desire the restoration of the carpet-bag governments in the South, and if successful we are absolutely secure against any attempts to set up our governments on a foundation of which the Federal Army and Navy constitute an essential part.' But he forgets that the contest here is not for the choice of Presidential electors and representatives in Congress alone, but for governor (who under our carpet-bag constitution appoints all State officers above the dignity of constable) and legislature as well; so that the success in Florida of the party calling itself Republican in November next will be, *ipso facto*, the restoration of carpet-bag rule over our people. Its leaders now are the same men who led it four and eight years since; its followers the same, its purposes the same now as then.

"We are told most impressively 'the Republican North will never be indifferent to State governments maintained by fraud.' Whether it will or not, will depend, if one may judge the future by the past, on the fact whether the State governments thus maintained are Republican or Democratic. State governments brought into being, as well as 'maintained,' precisely in this manner, existed for years in Louisiana and Florida, but professing to be Republican the Republican North beheld their existence, it seems to me, with considerable composure. Nothing is more notorious than the 'intimidation' for years, and now, brought to bear by their own race on colored people of these States to prevent them from casting Democratic votes—unless it is the 'frauds' by which their Returning Boards were able to convert minorities into majorities, and *vice versa*. But the victims being Democrats, I fancy the average Northern Republican thought they got just about what they deserved. And less than four years since (our friend will see I am not going back twenty or ten or even five years), when by one of the most memorable of these frauds, not by any means greater than its predecessors yet undeniable, the Presidency was given to the defeated candidate, was the Republican North very much grieved? Was it not, upon the whole, rejoiced? And though my favorite paper, the *Nation*, said in substance Mr. Hayes could not as a man of honor accept the office at the hands of the scamps composing the Louisiana Returning Board, he nevertheless did accept it at their hands; more: he rewarded the scamps for giving it to him, as he did quite a number of distinguished Northern Republican visiting statesmen who helped the scamps to give it to him. General Garfield, one of the 'statesmen,' for his participation in the work, or despite thereof, is, by a solid Republican North, if it can be made solid or nearly solid, to be rewarded with the succession to Mr. Hayes.

"Can our visiting friend put his hand upon his heart and say he verily believes the governing spirit of the Republican North would discountenance a resort to intimidation, whether among Southern negroes or Northern Democrats, if thought necessary to the success of their Presidential nominee? Let me read to him the following extract of a letter dated four days since, from an intelligent Southern woman summing North, written from Pottstown, in the midst of the iron-works of Pennsylvania. Pottstown is, I believe, the home of that most seeming virtuous Republican judge, Mr. Justice Strong, of the Supreme Court of the United States, whose influence should be potential there: 'They may talk of bulldozing in the South, but it is nothing to what they do here. All of the hands in the iron-works here are informed that if they vote the Democratic ticket they can leave. And so it is all over the North.'

"It will be gratifying to be assured that all reports like this are unfounded, that nothing of the kind is known, or at worst only to a very limited extent, in the establishments of the Republican manufacturers and capitalists of the North, and that the stupendous frauds charged as characterizing each succeeding election in Philadelphia, the second in population of all our American cities, are but a myth. I speak thus intending to justify no electoral fraud and no intimidation of voters perpetrated by Southern Democrats. Neither the one nor the other has marked our Florida elections to the extent

of changing the result in favor of the Democrats; while the latter have been, as already shown, repeatedly the victims of both.

"In conclusion, let me notice what the speaker has said about the Federal office-holders in the South. Admitting that 'many of the incumbents are unworthy,' he thinks they should, nevertheless, be retained in their places. That there can't be anything very wrong about them, else we have been 'singularly derelict in making known our grievances.' Well, as Mr. Greeley used to say, let us ventilate this matter a little. The chief actor in one of the most monstrous political frauds ever perpetrated in Florida or elsewhere, that of 1870, above mentioned, by which the returns from seven Democratic counties were rejected, was then Deputy-Marshal of the United States and Attorney-General of Florida. By that fraud he earned his promotion, and was promoted to the office of Marshal, and held it at the time of the inauguration of General Hayes. A member of the Florida bar, State and Federal, of fair standing, thereupon wrote to Mr. Devens, the newly-appointed United States Attorney-General, courteously asking, in the interest of civil-service reform, that the marshal be removed; assigning his participation in this fraud as the ground of the request. The communication was not even acknowledged, and, of course, no removal made. About the same time the same gentleman, in like courteous manner, addressed a letter to Postmaster-General Key, calling his attention to the postmaster at Tallahassee (a negro of very little education, an active and aggressive partisan, thoroughly inflammatory and incendiary in his political harangues to the ignorant masses of his own race), asking that he be removed, and some intelligent, non-partisan, white man be put in his place. This communication met with the same favor as the other. Of course no such person would be allowed to hold the same office at the capital of any Northern State for a day.

"Our visitor is mistaken in supposing that it is because we covet the emoluments of the Federal offices that we desire so earnestly a change in the incumbents, and to have their places filled, not necessarily by Democratic partisans, but by men whom we shall not have to fight at each succeeding election. He cannot readily appreciate, nor, I fear, with all his liberality, be able to do justice to our feelings in this matter; for the reason that, coming from a State where both parties are reasonably intelligent, their leaders fairly honest, their candidates usually reputable and well qualified, it can be there a matter of no serious consequence, at any ordinary election, which side is successful. How different here! where on the issue of the vote is dependent the question whether those who are to make and administer our laws shall come from the class of the community having most, and nearly all, of the intelligence, virtue, honesty, property of the State, little as it may be; or from the other class, embracing the ignorant, the vicious, the degraded, who, paying almost no taxes themselves, gloat in the prospect of levying them on others, and of reveling in and squandering them when collected. Left to themselves they are not dangerous, either as a party or otherwise; but organized into trained bands by active, cunning, and unprincipled Federal officers distributed throughout the State, though the Democrats have unquestionably a majority in the number of qualified voters, yet every election is *one of peril* to our most vital interests. I use no figure of speech in saying this: we can conceive of no greater calamity—not famine, not pestilence, nothing with which the Almighty ever visits a sinning and sinful people—more direful than the restoration to power of the men whom four years since we hurled therefrom.

"As he shall mingle with us, as he is cordially invited to do, our visitor will perceive with what intense interest, anxiety, even apprehension our people, not Democratic office-holders alone, nor expectants or aspirants, but the people, the taxpayers, the property-holders, anticipate the result here in Florida in November next. And surely it is no trifling matter to any community that it should for several months preceding each succeeding election-day be doomed to the anxieties, perils, and apprehensions of such a crisis. With deliverance from the horde of busy, active, unscrupulous, partisan carpet-bag and negro office-holders and retainers now in the pay of the general Government would come deliverance from all this. Hence we work and pray for the election of General Hancock in the hope that from him we shall obtain the deliverance for which we so earnestly yearn. And even should it chance to turn out, as our visitor tells us—though Mr. English, who is understood to have considerable stake in the country, thinks differently—that a change in the Federal office-holders North will 'breed corruption and jobbery in the public offices,' involving evils the effects of which the whole country will feel, what are these evils, though actual and appreciable, and not merely conjectural and imaginary, compared with those which I have already described, as to the existence of which here there can be no mistake and is no denial?

"No. The evil we fear is not official changes throughout the North, the effects of which, good or bad, may or may not reach us; but the indefinite continuation in their places of power and influence here in Florida of a set of pestilent mischief-makers and evil-doers supported at the public expense."

After a brief rejoinder by the "Emissary" the meeting quietly adjourned, leaving me to report the above reply for the *Nation*. R. B. HILTON.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA. September 1880.

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Any one who saw at the beginning of Hayes's administration how demoralized whole communities of our State were by the bare hope of getting an office, could not, it would seem, help becoming a civil-service reformer. There are, from whatever cause, a good many in our State besides myself who would like to belong to a civil-service reform club. But if any good is to be done in Virginia, the organization must support neither Garfield nor Hancock. Out of respect to the feelings of those among whom I shall have to work, I may even hope that the central committee will not long be the Independent Republican.

There is no better field for civil-service reformers to work in than the South. There are too many like R. B. Hilton (*Nation*, No. 786), who "desire, so far as this section is concerned, a 'clean sweep.'" They ought to know that the present incumbents would, under a good system, make better officers than any Hancock could put in under the "spoils system." The incompetent would, by the very nature of the reform we are striving for, be weeded out. I, for one, am willing to try the present office-holders, though our postmaster, for instance, does not spend in the post-office ten minutes a week, and one of the assistants has been in the office but once since Hayes was inaugurated. We must not wait till our party hold the offices to denounce rotation in office. We Democrats must not forget, either, that we began this mischief, and that reformed mischief-makers cannot better prove the sincerity of their conversion than by suffering for their principles.

A VIRGINIA DEMOCRAT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I approve of the idea of your correspondent "F. W. H.," and can promise ten subscribers to the Publication Society. At the same time, the advisability and utility of a conference seem to me questionable. Too many conferences without result have been held already in the campaign, and more are promised. If the Independent Republican Committee of New York would at once assume direction of the movement, and extend it by correspondence to other States, I am convinced that those interested in the reform would be satisfied, and there would be at least the hope of accomplishing something this autumn. That committee has already demonstrated its ability to conduct successfully a campaign for principle.

As neither General Garfield nor General Hancock represents distinctly civil-service reform, our efforts must be directed to furthering the election of Congressmen who will help to secure it by legislation. Open letters signed by any considerable number of Republicans and Democrats, addressed to candidates for Congress, asking a distinct expression of their views upon the subject of the civil service, and pledging the votes of the signers, independent of party connections, to the candidate from whom most could be expected, would compel attention to the issue, and would probably call out replies from candidates. Silence, at any rate, would naturally be construed as hostility to reform. In closely-contested districts, where the evils of the present system are apt to be greatest, by a happy dispensation of Providence our votes are most effective, and ought to be decisive. Action, however, must be undertaken at once, as Congressional nominations are being made every day and public sentiment is being formed, which, once settled, can be turned with great difficulty. In New York State the issue might be carried into the choice of Assemblymen. No Independent Republican, I take it, will support a candidate for Assembly whose vote by any possibility might help to send to the United States Senate Mr. Thomas Platt, or any of his kind. C.

ALBANY, N. Y., Sept. 10, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I belong to that class of Young America spoken of lately by a writer in the *Nation* as somewhat distrustful and sceptical in their views of America, of their countrymen, and of themselves. Though, on the whole, hopeful for the future and not despondent as regards the present, they are inclined to think that some things may be mended in our political and social life. They believe that on the whole America is the best country, and the Americans the greatest nation, on the foot-stool, but they are not so cock-sure that something may not be learned from "abroad." They are not very fond of marching in torchlight processions, nor do they greatly care for listening to the harangues of loud-voiced though rather harmless demagogues at the raising of ward-wigwags. They are generally pretty busy with their own affairs, but still they are not unwilling to give some time and energy to politics, if they could feel that their efforts were of any account.

The front of the Independent movement is largely made up from this class, and that they are not altogether without influence is evident from the real rancor which the stock politicians manifest towards them here and elsewhere—a very different thing from the hostility which the former assume for the sake of appearances against those of the opposite party, but which is hardly skin-deep.

The plan of a Civil-Service Reform Publication Society I find meets with quite general approval from Young America of this type, and many whom I know will be glad to help on the cause in a quiet way. At the same time with this I send to the Independent Republican Committee the names of seven men besides my own who can all be counted on for subscriptions of from one to five dollars. I think I could, without much difficulty, obtain a dozen more. Let a few other readers of the *Nation* take hold of the matter in the same way, and the Society will soon be under way. R. S.

BUFFALO, Sept. 11, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have for years regarded fixity of office-tenure the most important reform question to be brought to the careful attention of our people. I am therefore glad to see that a society will probably be formed to use all proper methods to accomplish the desired end. If each of the 8,400 subscribers to the *Nation* would subscribe thereto, a sufficient fund would be forthcoming at once, and, as one of them, put me down for five or ten dollars, as may be needed; and, as the work can't be done in a year, I expect to be a yearly subscriber until the good fight is won.—Truly yours, C. D. RITCHIE.

N. W. COR. THIRTY-FOURTH AND HAMILTON STREETS,
PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 11, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There is no greater pleasure than to see the best minds and hearts in the nation suddenly breaking out into print and earnestly advocating principles and methods of action which one has been preaching for years in private and doing one's utmost to propagate. This thought is suggested by the numerous letters of approval you publish to the proposal to found a Civil-Service Reform Society to print documents and educate the masses in those principles which must eventually conquer if the Republic is to continue to exist.

But the question arises whether the letters you publish really indicate the wide-spread feeling they seem to suggest. I question it, and for this reason: Nearly a year ago I wrote a long letter to the most prominent civil-service reformer in the country, advocating this very plan, speaking of the utter ignorance of the people at large as to the nature of the question of reform, and advising the formation of a society to publish pamphlets, leaflets, and tracts, and send out speakers to explain to the mechanics and farmers how this question touched their pockets and concerned their prosperity and happiness. I suggested also the formation of branch societies all over the country, like the anti-slavery associations of thirty years ago, and I urged the gentleman in question to put himself at the head of this movement, saying our motto should be "Organize, organize, organize!" I offered in conclusion to begin such a society among the workmen in my own neighborhood, and to contribute \$100 toward the general fund. His reply, although extremely kind and courteous, was very discouraging. He said in effect that the time had not come to begin the good work, and that the people would not recognize the same deep moral question involved as in slavery. He did not, in fact, believe in the plan, and, although urging me to continue to preach these doctrines in private, discouraged all present action.

The name of this gentleman is so identified with civil-service reform, and his opinions so respected, that his declining to have anything to do with such a movement as a leader prevented my making public in your columns my proposal or organizing a club myself. I mention all this because your correspondents' hopeful letters fill me with pleasure to see others planning and longing to see fulfilled such a noble purpose, and yet with a half-despair as he thinks how our natural leaders are lacking in enthusiasm and determination. The letter from this eminent gentleman (which I would publish had I the right to do so) makes me fear that it is only in the unknown privates that readiness to work and to sacrifice exists, and that the generals remain passive-souled and sluggish.

Can you not call on them to come forward and head this movement? I repeat my offer of \$100. I wish it could be multiplied tenfold, for as a patriotic American and as an intense Yankee I yet feel that our future depends more on the settlement of this question than on any other point. God speed the work which will remove America from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, and separate her from the methods of the "unspeakable Turk"!—I remain, etc. A. M. S.

NEW YORK, Sept. 13.

THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF ATHENS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Having spent the whole of last winter and spring in Athens occupying my time almost exclusively in the study of the remaining antiquities of the city and neighborhood, I cannot but associate myself heartily with Mr. Stillman's strictures upon the management of the Archaeological Society of Athens which appeared in his letter published in your last number. Not only

is the Society slow about pushing on the excavations, as Mr. Stillman states, but it fails to protect those remains of the ancient city which are not preserved from injury, at least, by the earth which has accumulated over them.

The western slope of the Museum Hill, a great part of the Pnyx, and the whole of the Hill of the Nymphs, are—or, rather, were—covered with very perfect and interesting remains of the old city. We find here, both within the walls of the city proper and between the Long Walls to the Piræus, foundations of houses, flights of steps, cisterns, alleys, and streets deeply marked by the chariot-wheels—all cut in the solid rock. A great part of these remains upon the Hill of the Nymphs has perished, the hill having been used, without opposition, as a quarry by the ignorant populace of the neighboring quarter of the modern city. Fortunately, there is an exact plan of this part of ancient Athens, made some years ago by M. Burnouf.

A large piece of the summit of Lycabettus has been blasted off in the same way, to obtain building-stone, although stone may be had in abundance at a little distance from these historic hills—sites which are the world's property, and should be protected by the united influence of all antiquarians, without regard to nationality. Since leaving Athens I have received information that a great part of the Museum Hill has been bought by a private individual—I fear for no purpose in the interest of archaeology and art. But it would take too long to enumerate all the instances of that Society's neglect of the priceless treasure committed to its keeping; to tell how half of the "white hill of Colonus" has been blasted away, like Lycabettus and the Nymphæum; how the arch is permitted to remain over the cella of the Theseum, which it is gradually deforming by its thrust; how the tops of steles and other funeral monuments are seen projecting from the ground around the gas-works upon the Sacred Way to Eleusis, just outside of the Dipylon Gate.

However, I cannot sympathize entirely with Mr. Stillman's views about the Greek law relating to the exportation of antiquities. The resources of the Archaeological Society are so small that, even if well expended, they could not make very rapid progress; and it seems to me that we ought not to complain too much, for the present, if the Society would but protect what it has. And the ignorance of the people, owing to their recent emancipation from the most degraded slavery, is unavoidably so great, especially in matters relating to archaeology and art, that, were it not for the law above alluded to, Greece might soon be compelled to send her students abroad to study the antiquities of their own country. As it is, a beginning, at least, has been made in the right direction. In the Varvakeion Museum the collection of vases and terra-cottas, though still awaiting classification, is excellent, and in the Patissia Museum (chiefly for sculpture), among many interesting and beautiful statues and bas-reliefs, are two statues in particular—a Meleager and an Apollo—which are, perhaps, equal to any ancient statuary remaining to us, except the Parthenon marbles. I cannot but think that the Elgin marbles—though it was, perhaps, well to remove them to London in the beginning of the century—would now do more service if they could be returned to their native Acropolis. Many of the pieces—the Southern metopes, for instance, so barbarously torn from their places—could easily be restored to their original positions in the Parthenon; while the others could take the places of the plaster casts which now fill the little Museum on the Acropolis. Athens is now so easy of access that all true lovers of Greek art would be amply repaid for the labor of the journey by the increased advantage and interest of studying those noblest productions of ancient art under their own pure sky, and, so far as possible, in their original positions, and in connection with the glorious monuments which they were designed to complete and to adorn.—I am, yours very respectfully,

THOMAS W. LUDLOW.

NO. 14 EAST SIXTEENTH STREET, NEW YORK,
September 7, 1860.

Notes.

THE first volume of Surgeon J. S. Billings's 'Index Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office, U. S. A.' (A-Berlin'ski) has just appeared. Three years ago (*Nation* No. 568) we noticed the "Specimen Fasciculus" of this stupendous work, and gave some description of the scheme of it. We shall hope to return to it again. The present instalment fills 888 pages, large octavo, in double columns, with the catalogue proper; while 126 pages additional are required for a list of the medical periodicals whose contents are here indexed, and the abbreviations by which they are designated.—Part XI. of Grove's 'Dictionary of Music and Musicians' (Macmillan) has perhaps not been rivalled by any other in average quality, for it embraces very few titles besides Opera, Oratorio, Orchestra, Orchestration, Organ, Overture—all themes of the first importance—Pacchierotti, Paganini, and Palestrina (unfinished). Under Orchestra is given a list of the instruments used by fourteen of the most celebrated orchestras of the present day; in these, while the bass drum is always a unit, the violins range from eight to ninety-two in number. Under Organ we find a number of curious and useful

cuts, and a history of the great English church and cathedral organs *seriatim*. Landseer's rough sketch of Paganini serves in lieu of a more serious portrait. An article is devoted to the career and works of Mr. J. K. Paine, the Boston composer.—D. Appleton & Co. have reprinted in two full volumes the sixth English edition of 'Cooley's Cyclopædia of Practical Receipts, Processes, and Collateral Information.' With its balsams, decoctions, draughts, drops, electuaries, essences, extracts, infusions, pills, spirits, syrups, tinctures, waters, and wines, it recommends itself especially to apothecaries. Its scope will otherwise be indicated by such titles as alcoholometry, blacking, bread, cements, cupping, electrotype, enamel, enemas, filtration, fritters, gargles, gems, glass, ink, pastry, phonograph, proofs (printer's), salicylic acid, sewage, soaps, soups, still, telephone, urine, etc., etc. Some of the articles, *4 gr.*, stoves, are inadequate for American use.—J. R. Osgood & Co. send us 'Perkins's Congressional-District Vote Map,' intended to show by parallel bars of color, on a given scale, the relative strength of parties as indicated by the vote of 1878. It seems to us to have few advantages over the figures on which it is based, and which are printed in the margin.—'Studies from the Great British Authors,' by H. H. Morgan (St. Louis: G. I. Jones & Co.), is a compilation of extracts from the works of the principal English writers from Chaucer to Macaulay, and consequently comprises, as a matter of course, much excellent reading. The editor's work in every respect, however, is such as almost any one could have performed.—Henry A. Sumner & Co., of Chicago, issue in two volumes a third edition of 'Essays in Biography and Criticism,' by Peter Bayne, M.A. The first has a preface, and to the second is prefixed a short but enthusiastic notice of the author, and we need only remark upon the publication that, since prefaces are rarely read, and in view of the faults common to youth (faults in some degree outgrown by Mr. Bayne) in which the essays are steeped, it would have been fair to have appended to these a date indicating how long ago the first edition appeared. Whether this time was recent or remote, however, cannot make the resurrection a matter of importance.—The official records of the war of the rebellion, now being prepared under the direction of Col. Robert N. Scott, will be issued in four series, viz., (1) formal reports of military operations, with correspondence, orders, etc., and an atlas—Confederate accounts of any event immediately following the Union—in all, 80 volumes octavo, of some 800 pages each; (2) correspondence, etc., relating to prisoners—4 vols.; (3) other correspondence, etc., Union—8 vols.; (4) ditto, Confederate—4 vols.—The happy contagion of examples of public spirit is nowhere better manifested than in Cincinnati, where Mr. Charles R. West has just offered to give \$150,000 towards building an art museum, if a like amount is raised. This will certainly come to pass.—Sampson Low & Co., London, have in press 'Forty Years' Recollections, Literary and Political,' by a Chartist leader, Mr. Thomas Frost.—A sequel to his 'Caliban' has been lately begun by Renan in the Paris *Temps* as a feuilleton, under the title of "L'Eau de Jouvence" (Water of Youth).—'De la Législation du Théâtre en France,' by M. Albert Guichard (New York: F. W. Christern), is better adapted than any of its immediate predecessors for giving the foreigner an exact idea of the principles which govern and regulate authors, actors, and managers in France. M. Guichard's treatise is laid out with logical accuracy, and in each of its divisions is a historical summary, leading easily up to the statement of the present state of the law. Literary quotations are apt and frequent, and the book abounds in facts and figures not easily attainable elsewhere.—Good maps of South America are still far from abundant. Notice may therefore be taken of the maps of the upper course of the Uruguay in Brazil, and of the river district of Peru, in No. 87 of the Berlin Geographical Society's *Zeitschrift* (New York: L. W. Schmidt). For the first time, we believe, a chart accompanies the *Verhandlungen* of the same Society (vol. vii., No. 4, 5) showing the route of Nordenskiöld's expedition from the Baltic to Yokohama.

—We continue our abstract of fall announcements with the list of G. P. Putnam's Sons, which includes 'Unbeaten Tracks in Japan,' by Isabella Bird; 'Holland and its People,' by Edmondo de Amicis; 'Portugal, Old and New,' by Oswald Crawford; Viollet-le-Duc's 'Learning to Draw' (Young Designer), translated by Virginia Champlin; a new edition, revised, of Leslie Stephen's 'History of English Thought in the 18th Century'; 'Art Suggestions from the Masters,' by Mrs. Susan N. Carter; 'The Comprehensive Atlas,' 122 maps, folio; new and cheaper editions of Frothingham's 'Life of Theodore Parker' and 'History of Transcendentalism in New England'; 'A Doctor's Suggestions to the Community,' by Dr. Roosa; and 'My Investment on the Mississippi,' by George C. Benham—a Northern cotton-planter who, had he not persevered to the end, might have thought his a "fool's errand." Messrs. Putnam will also publish for the Society of Political Education a "library" beginning with Nordhoff's 'Politics for Young Americans,' Johnston's 'History of American Politics,' Perry's 'Introduction to Political Economy,' and McAdam's 'Alphabet of Finance,' and to be sold only in sets.

—The difficulty of making good text-books is apt to be in due proportion

to their importance, though the undertaking is too often considered a humble part of literary journeyman work. Three works before us illustrate in varying degree, however, that the difficulty is greatly increased in the case of art text-books. In art an hour's personal instruction may almost be said to be equal to a week's study of written directions; and the more elementary the aim of these the more necessity—generally absolute, we should be inclined to say—of a master's guidance. Such books as Couture's lectures or Hunt's 'Hints' are not addressed to beginners, and have the value of suggestiveness without being hampered by explicit elementariness. 'Modelling in Clay,' by A. L. Vago, with an appendix on modelling foliage, etc., by Benn Pitman (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co.); a translation of Karl Robert's 'Le Fusain,' being "a complete practical treatise on landscape-drawing in charcoal" (same publishers); and 'Handbook of Drawing,' by William Walker (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), on the other hand, are designed for persons who know nothing of the subjects treated. After examining them we feel justified in concluding that none will be of much practical use to the beginner, the first especially, in which little more is attempted than to describe tools and insist on phrenology. The case is somewhat different with charcoal-drawing, which it is possible to describe more or less adequately to a draughtsman, and it is well enough done by Robert. But even here we question if the information conveyed is not already possessed by those to whom it can be of value. As for Mr. Walker's book, it is, like the others, very explicit in mechanical directions, and much more comprehensive, instructing the reader about art in general, and taking him as far in detail as technical perspective. We cannot refrain from giving one example of its convincing manner of enforcing important truths. Concerning the value of observation, it says (p. 8): "If a person were to travel, say, from Liverpool to London, and hold a looking-glass so as to have all the objects reflected in it as they were passed, on arriving in London there would be nothing left on the glass but the last image—perhaps the station; all the other myriads of objects would be gone. It is just so," etc., etc. All three books irresistibly recall such works as 'The Banjo without a Master,' and treatises purporting to teach legerdemain and ventriloquism in a few lessons, which it is well known to ingenious youth are snares and delusions. We suspect the service done by all such is generally limited to the awakening or quickening of an interest in the subject.

—The permanence of American political institutions is a subject of public speculation considerably out of proportion to the private alarm which the question excites, but the discussion of it by a publicist such as Prof. Dwight, of the Columbia College Law School, is worth notice. It formed the subject of an address before the Hamilton College alumni last June, which has just been reprinted in a small pamphlet. Following the plan of such addresses, it is perhaps rather elaborate and elementary, and much of it might have been addressed to the author's law classes, but it recalls principles which do not just now receive the attention they deserve. The physical configuration of the country, and the unity in management demanded by the unity of nature, as well as the complicated system of government made necessary by a diversity of climate and productions; our inheritance of English political ideas and institutions, especially English parliamentary and criminal law, and of an English respect for court decisions; a popular conservatism, to which even modern England affords no parallel; the absence of powerful neighbors to force us to modify our theories, with the accompanying circumstance that our political and social life is thoroughly American and not international; the persistence of the religious sentiment, unaffected by modern theories of science and profoundly respected in America; the general prevalence of political virtue, "with due abatement for persistent office-seekers and people of that ilk"; "the readiness of the people to respond to appeals of a moral nature in the management of their public affairs"; the subdivision of land, and the facility of its acquisition and transfer; American systems of primary and secondary education, which are by no means perfect, but improving every decade; the growing interest of "our best citizens" in philanthropic schemes, whereby the latter are not devolved upon the Government; finally, the element of publicity, are reviewed by Prof. Dwight with confidence, but, it is to be said, without the neglect of qualifying considerations which renders a writer open to the charge of optimism. His explanation of American conservatism, we may add, is, first, the great variety of interests, and the difficulty of so innovating as to win the support of a majority; second, "the sentiment that there is nothing left for us to conquer," all great questions being settled, politics being now mainly administrative, and existing problems considered of too little consequence to awaken universal interest.

—Rhode Island's priority, in either hemisphere, in establishing the liberty of religious opinion among the bases of government, is a favorite theme with her writers. They cannot well treat it, nor are they particularly anxious to do so, without drawing an invidious comparison with Massachusetts, and it is natural for them to identify precedence with cause, and to attribute to Rhode Island the present degree of religious toleration throughout the United States at least. Among the local historians whose blood is still stirred by the cir-

cumstances which drove Roger Williams into the wilderness, is Dr. Henry E. Turner, of Newport. A paper read by him in February before the Rhode Island Historical Society has just been printed (and very badly printed) by the Newport Historical Publishing Co. Its title is, 'The Settlers of Aquidneck and Liberty of Conscience,' and it is occupied first with tracing the steps which compelled certain heretical Boston deputies to remove from the colony in March, 1638, to the northern end of Rhode Island, then known as Pocasset, and since as Portsmouth. The speedy division of the new colony and the founding of Newport; the subsequent reconciliation and political concord of the two settlements; and the careful preservation by statute of the principle of toleration in Providence, Warwick, and Rhode Island, are next successively illustrated from the records. "What do not Christianity, commerce, science, and the arts," concludes Dr. Turner, "owe to the three little communities which were driven from Massachusetts for nonconformity," etc. The way in which the obnoxious Boston deputies were rejected by the Massachusetts General Court in April, 1637 (which "found a means to send them home again, for that two of the freemen of Boston had not notice of the election"), seems to Dr. Turner to differ from the Maine frauds of last year only in having the decency of a plausible excuse. In general, however, this writer renders full justice to the Puritan character.

—Almost coincidentally with the session of the American Association at Boston were held the meetings of the French and British Associations, the former at Rheims and the latter at Swansea. Judging from the meagre accounts that have as yet come to hand, it would appear that the French scientists were content with discussing subjects more of a special than of a general character, scarcely entering into those broad topics which it has of late been customary to associate with the addresses of their sister naturalists across the Channel. The presidential address of Prof. A. C. Ramsay, successor to Sir Roderick Murchison, as Director-General of the British Geological Survey, is a carefully elaborated statement of what might be termed chronological geology, setting forth the epochs and localities at which certain well-known physical phenomena have repeated themselves during the period of geological history. From the occurrence of metamorphism, volcanism, glaciation, and other geological "incidents" throughout almost the entire series of formations from the Laurentian to the Post-Tertiary, it is assumed to be shown that the forces operating these phenomena, as well as the phenomena themselves, differ neither in kind nor intensity from the similar forces and phenomena with which we are now more or less familiar. Prof. Ramsay, who is one of the few surviving geologists of note who can claim in their labors intimate relationship with nearly all the master minds of geological science from its foundation by William Smith to the present day, is strongly anti-cataclysmal in his views, and therefore a firm upholder of the Lyellian doctrine of uniformity. His conclusions, which are shared by the vast majority of living geologists, will probably not be considered as final by those who still delight in having recourse to unknown and visionary forces; and, indeed, it must be confessed it would be difficult from the examples furnished in the address to prove that, even if past and present forces and phenomena were equal in kind, they were likewise equal in intensity. The address of Dr. Günther, president of the biological section, treats of (scientific) museums, and ought to be carefully considered by all who are interested in the proper maintenance of institutions of this kind. It will be found very opportune in this country, where, in addition to the National Museum at Washington, there are at present a number of other museums which are in course of construction, or which have but lately been completed.

—Ole Bull died at his home on the island Lysø (Isle of Light), near Bergen, Norway, on Tuesday noon, August 17. He was born on the 5th of February, 1810, and ever since his remarkably successful appearance in Bologna in 1834, as a substitute for Beriot, his name has been before the public. His father, who was in very comfortable circumstances, wanted the boy to study theology, and had he acquiesced in his parent's wishes he would, no doubt, have been saved from many of the pecuniary embarrassments which troubled him in his early days. At the age of four or five years he could reproduce on a small violin all the songs he heard his mother sing, and at the age of eight he played the first violin at the Bergen Theatre. At the age of eighteen he was sent to the university, but failed in his examinations. In Christiania he also played at the theatre, and by the help of friends he was enabled in 1829 to go to Germany to seek instruction from the celebrated violinist Spohr, in Cassel. On Spohr's invitation he accompanied him to Nordhausen, where a concert was to be given. Here he heard Spohr and others play, but found their execution so cold that he left the concert overwhelmed with despair, thinking he must have mistaken his calling. He now joined some jolly students, who were returning from a Harz Mountain tour, and for the next two months there was "ein lustiges Leben" around Ole Bull's violin in Göttingen, where he made a pretence of studying law. After a visit to Norway, he next betook himself to Paris, and fared hardly for a year or two. When the cholera drove him from the boarding-house which

had been found for him by the Swedish-Norwegian ambassador, he chanced to get lodgings with a lady who saw in the young man's countenance a striking resemblance to her son, who had recently died, and Mr. Bull himself became deeply attached to the lady's granddaughter, Alexandrine Félicité Villeminot, whom he afterwards married. On the 18th of April, 1832, he gave his first public concert in Paris, assisted by Ernst and other artists, and with a net profit of 1,400 francs. From this time we find him making rapid progress and giving a number of successful concerts in Switzerland and Italy, until he finally, in 1834, made his grand triumph at Bologna. In 1835 he played in Casa Lepre at Rome, where, after the performance of his famous "Polacca Guerriera," the sculptor Thorwaldsen sprang upon the stage and embraced him in the presence of an audience wild with enthusiasm. A few months later "the wild man from the North," as Jules Janin termed him in some extravagant eulogy in the *Débats*, was playing at the Opéra in Paris. In 1843 he first visited this country, creating a *furor* which is still remembered by many. In 1850 he built a theatre in Bergen, but soon got involved in litigation with the city authorities, and the theatre passed into other hands. In 1852 he bought a tract of land in Potter Co., Pennsylvania, on which he tried to form a Norwegian colony, but discovered that the parties who had sold him 120,000 acres did not own a foot of it. He again lost a large sum of money in useless litigation, and had to return to his violin. It was Ole Bull who found Jenny Lind, a girl of eighteen, ruining her voice in the Royal Opera in Stockholm. He laid the matter personally before the king, and succeeded in getting her sent to Paris, where she rapidly made her way to fame. Though always unlucky in his financial enterprises, he did not get out of tune with the world, but to the last was a man of a genial, cheerful nature, always ready to lend his professional services for charitable purposes. On one of his last visits to New York he played for the benefit of the Irish sufferers.

—It is true, however, that Ole Bull outlived his reputation, and that his later performances gave more distress than pleasure to connoisseurs. His own compositions were seldom written down, and the orchestra which accompanied him saw only its own score. His obituary biographers have fallen into numerous errors, owing mainly to their having followed the account of his life in Appleton's "Cyclopædia." No man was ever "killed" by Ole Bull in a duel. He never tried to "commit suicide by throwing himself into the Seine." He never "took part in a campaign in Algeria against the Kabyles with Gen. Yusuf." He never "established any national schools of literature and art in Norway." Nor does the "Cyclopædia" state the facts correctly in regard to his Pennsylvania colony. His second wife was not "a German woman," as stated by most of the papers, but a Wisconsin lady, whose parents were born in New England. Her maiden name was Thorp, and with her he leaves not "a son," but a daughter nearly ten years old. Two children by his first wife are still living, a daughter and a son, Alexander, who, like his father, is an excellent violinist.

—Perthes, in Gotha, has just published a third edition of the 'Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen,' by Johann Gustav Droysen, a work the reputation of which is familiar to all students as the standard modern life of Alexander, and perhaps the best known work of this eminent historian (New York: B. Westermann & Co.) Droysen's point of view is that of the admirer and sympathizer, not as one dazzled by military successes, but as seeing in the career of the conqueror a great and wholesome plan, and an important epoch in history. It appears to him that the *Particularismus* of Greece had proved wholly incapable of remedy; with all admiration for the part which Athens had taken in the earlier struggles and national development, and with all recognition of the greatness and sincerity of Demosthenes and his compeers, he yet holds (p. 22) that their success at this juncture could have resulted only in a renewal of the old Athenian league, or the establishment of an Athenian empire, neither of which could build up a real unity of the Grecian states. The Macedonian leadership could alone unite Greece and conduct its united forces against Asia. In this conquering expedition, again, the historian sees conceptions and aims of the highest statesmanship. He does not attribute to Alexander (p. 221) the desire to carry out Aristotle's view, that the Grecian was formed by nature to rule over the barbarian, but a far more generous idea, to carry freedom and progress to the barbarians. It was with this view that, in his intercourse with the Asiatics, he assumed Asiatic dress and manners, while still meeting his own officers and soldiers in his old way. But this policy of placing the two nationalities on an equality offended his old officers. Hephaestion and Krateros comprehended and sympathized with it, but Parmenion was alienated; hence his downfall, which, by the way, the historian does not attempt to justify. There are five maps (plans of Granikos, Issos, Gaugamela, and the campaign against Poros, and a large map of Alexander's campaigns); but no index and only a very insufficient table of contents.

—Of the Sacred Books of the East, published by the Oxford University under the editorship of Prof. Müller, have just appeared three new volumes, numbered as iv., v., and vii. of the series (Macmillan). The two first concern

the religion of Zoroaster: iv. is a translation, by the young French scholar, James Darmesteter, of the Vendidad, as first division of the Zend-Avesta; v., by E. W. West, gives a version of the Bundehesh and other documents, in Pehlevi, of the modern period of the religion. The remaining volume is a translation, by Prof. J. Jolly, of Würzburg, of the 'Institutes of Vishnu,' one of the Hindoo law-books of a class of which Manu is the leading and best-known representative. All are enriched with long and elaborate prefaces, which will be found of high value by scholars as well as by general readers. The one of widest interest, doubtless, is that of M. Darmesteter, which contains an account of the discovery and interpretation of the Avesta, of its formation as a collection, and of the origin and history of the religion. Some of the author's peculiar views—as the orderly and natural development of Zoroastrianism out of the primitive Indo-Iranian faith, and the non-historical character of Zoroaster—are opposed to those now prevalent, and will meet, as they have met, with much question and opposition; but no one will deny the ability with which they are put forth and supported.

DEXTER'S CONGREGATIONALISM.*

THERE is little risk in venturing the assertion that no work has issued from the American press for many years embodying the result of more diligent and intelligent research than this massive volume. On every page it bears abundant evidences of the painstaking labor that only follows from long and enthusiastic devotion to a particular subject. For the task which he has so zealously performed Dr. Dexter seems, to borrow a phrase of Milton, to have been "solemnly elected." He is a striking example of what his New England fathers would have termed foreordination. Born, he tells us in his preface, within ten miles of Plymouth Rock, with the blood of the earliest annalist of the old Colony coursing through his veins, it has been with him from childhood a filial duty to study the history of the Pilgrims, and in repeated visits to the Old World he has made it his aim to collect ample materials for further elucidating it. The present work, consisting of lectures given at the request of the authorities of the Andover Seminary, presents some of the results of those researches, yet is regarded by the author as merely preparing the way for the main work of his life. But while Dr. Dexter modestly terms the volume before us a mere episode, it is, in fact, an original contribution, of great importance, to our religious history. Though at first sight it might seem that the ecclesiastical annals of New England had been so thoroughly explored that nothing of value could be left to reward the most diligent research, yet it is a fact that some of the most curious and valuable material has not been brought to light until a very recent period. The manuscript of Governor Bradford's 'History' was only discovered, it will be remembered, a quarter of a century ago, and following, apparently, the useful hint that this discovery suggested, Dr. Dexter has been able to avail himself of sources to which none of the earlier historians of Puritanism had access. It is certainly an odd circumstance that to the zeal of some of the predecessors of the present Archbishops of Canterbury and York we owe the preservation of some of the most curious memorials of the early Separatists. But for the accident that in their libraries have been stored up many treatises, whose authors were either exiled or hung, we should be destitute of the most authentic material for tracing the early course of that religious movement in which, Dr. Dexter asserts, New England Congregationalism had its origin. The restrictions which for a long time closed these collections to historical students have been removed, and the author of this volume has enjoyed free access to works for which Neal and Cotton Mather sighed in vain. As a consequence, we are now placed in possession of a survey of the writings of the early advocates of the Congregational Church polity which, for exactness and comprehensiveness, has, so far as we know, nothing that can be compared with it.

With this abundance of new material, so intelligent and independent an enquirer as Dr. Dexter could hardly fail of arriving at some novel conclusions. Thus, he does not hesitate to claim a new hearing for Robert Browne, of whom he was fortunate enough to discover, among the treasures of the Lambeth Library, a sort of spiritual autobiography, and whom he pronounces, on the whole, a good and singularly clever man, though eccentric and probably insane. Respecting the authorship of the famous Martin Marprelate pamphlets he also advances a new theory, holding that they were the work, not of Job Throckmorton, as recently maintained by Arber, but of Henry Barrowe. Dr. Dexter, who has been the first to gain sight of the entire collection, is inclined to place a much higher estimate upon these tracts than the writers who have preceded him, but he surely forgets Piers Ploughman when he says "that they furnish the first instance in the English tongue of the employment of satire as a successful weapon against ecclesiastical wrong." Another instance of the author's willingness to run counter to popular opinion is found in the decided manner in which he argues that the

* The Congregationalism of the last Three Hundred Years, as seen in its Literature. Twelve Lectures delivered in the Andover Theological Seminary, by Henry Martyn Dexter. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1883.

famous saying reported of John Robinson had no such meaning as has been ascribed to it. The Leyden pastor, according to Dr. Dexter, did not speak after the manner of an "advanced thinker" of the present day, but had in mind simply the existing differences about church polity. With regard to the Congregationalism that came afterwards to be set up in New England, the author also presents some conclusions that do not accord precisely with commonly received opinions. New-Englanders as a class have been much inclined to exalt the faith and principles of their fathers, and no one has been more generally regarded as the head and front of New England Congregationalism than the famous John Cotton, the first minister of the Boston Church. But, according to Dr. Dexter, this is a mistaken notion, and the founders of New England did not clearly apprehend their own principles. For the first hundred years of its history Congregationalism, he assures us, was not consistent with itself, being, in fact, a modified form of Presbyterianism derived, not from Robert Browne, but from Henry Barrowe. In the opinion of Dr. Dexter, the true founder of Congregationalism, upon its pure democratic foundation, was John Wise, of Ipswich, whose reply to the "Proposals" of the Boston clergy embodied the first clear and cogent argument for unmixed popular rule as the only legitimate government for church or state. The author discusses with great fulness the functions of ecclesiastical councils, and undertakes to define the precise meaning of Congregationalism.

While disposed to recognize most heartily the unwearied research which this volume evinces, we must still be permitted to doubt whether the result which the author reaches is at all commensurate with the pains he has taken. Dr. Dexter is a zealous Congregationalist, and his evident aim throughout these lectures is to exalt the polity to which he is so sincerely attached; but we cannot resist the conclusion that he has been far more successful in establishing his own reputation as a learned and sagacious historical enquirer than in setting forth the attractiveness or the advantages of the ecclesiastical system whose origin and history he so faithfully explores. We cannot imagine that a Congregationalist, accustomed to dwell with pride upon the names that have rendered New England illustrious, will have his complacency much increased by the assurances that his ecclesiastical polity had its origin in the crude fancies of a man who lived to disavow his own opinions, and respecting whom the most charitable supposition that can be made is that he was mad. Nor is one who is not a Congregationalist likely to be persuaded of the advantage of that polity by the picture which Dr. Dexter gives us of the wretched bickerings of the exiles in Holland, who seem no sooner to have escaped persecution at home than they fell into most discreditable differences with one another. The controversy about Mrs. Johnson's gown is surely not calculated to heighten our respect for those early Separatists. Nor is it altogether pleasant to have the researches of Dr. Dexter strip John Robinson of the sole claim to distinction that raised him above the dead-level of his age. We respect the frankness with which the author of these lectures lays before us the results of his researches, but we fancy that the impression left on the minds of his more intelligent readers will not be precisely what he intended. As an exposition of Congregationalism as a system, this volume cannot be accepted as very satisfactory. Dr. Dexter's strength lies much more in laborious investigation than in philosophical exposition. He is more successful in ascertaining a fact than in estimating its significance, and possesses the aptitudes of an antiquary rather than a historian. Hence, when he undertakes to lay down general principles, he is not always consistent with himself. Thus, he makes Congregationalism consist essentially of two things, the complete autonomy of the local church and its relation to other churches by means of councils. By this definition the Independent churches of England have no claim to be called Congregational, yet he does not hesitate to insert an elaborate chapter on Congregationalism in England. Again, in his eagerness to deny to Unitarian churches the title of Congregational, he argues strongly that Congregationalism is not only a polity but a creed; yet the English Congregationalists not only have no formal creed, but the fact is notorious that they could not adopt one, that an immense majority of their ministers are only moderately Calvinistic, and that by many the doctrine of eternal punishment is no longer held. Dr. Dexter has a curious way of changing his tone. He claims for Robert Browne a place "among the great thinkers of Liberalism," yet resents it as a wrong that Robinson should be reckoned among "advanced thinkers." The reader is left somewhat puzzled with regard to the system which he so fondly presents as a type of the millennial church.

THE "POLICY OF PALMERSTON."*

DURING the elections in England many respectable Liberals tried to define their attitude in reference to foreign affairs by expressing their approval of the "policy of Palmerston." The formula meant, or was intended to mean, something. It was pretty well understood to imply that the candidate who used it did not endorse the policy of Lord Beaconsfield; it was sup-

posed, further, to hint that he did not entirely approve of the peaceful and humanitarian tendencies attributed, whether rightly or not, to Mr. Gladstone. But, though this phraseology was not absolutely without signification, we may conjecture that its main merit was a certain sonorous vagueness which, while it impressed the audience, did not commit the speaker to the support of any very definite course of action; and, further, that even those Liberals who expressed with genuine fervor their admiration for a leader whose name is still popular with his countrymen, did not accurately define to themselves what, if any, were the peculiarities of Palmerston's statesmanship. Ideas, however, which are neither accurate nor well defined have often great weight with mankind, and persons engaged rather with the theoretical than with the practical aspects of politics may find a good deal of interest and instruction in studying the shorter and improved edition of the "Life of Lord Palmerston," with a view to discover (if may be) what were the essential traits of a policy which commanded the approval of the English nation.

The first and most salient feature of Lord Palmerston's statesmanship is, if one may be excused something like a bull, that it exhibits no fixed policy at all. He was not a man of abstract ideas; he was utterly unlike, for example, a leader such as Cobden, who pursued through life certain fixed notions which, whether one admires them or not, give the color to his whole career. He was, again, thoroughly unlike either such a noble dreamer as Mazzini or such an ignoble dreamer as Louis Napoleon. Of dreams or visions, of abstract ideas, of fixed and immutable lines of policy, the English premier knew nothing. From such things both his defects and his merits kept him aloof. His moral fibre was rather tough. No man of keen susceptibilities would have hastened to greet the President when Louis Napoleon's hands were dripping with the blood of slaughtered citizens. He was also—and herein lay the strength of his nature—full of life, and, within a limited range of vision, saw things as they were. If he overlooked the moral defects, he saw the political strength of the President's position with an insight displayed by no other Englishman but Walter Bagehot. This freedom from the influence of ideas or dreams made Palmerston from first to last a "hand-to-mouth" statesman. With great energy, with great tact, and often with pre-eminent success, he met the wants of the day as they arose. Sufficient for the day were, in his eyes, the good and the evil thereof. Philosophers and enthusiasts will be inclined to think that to call a political leader a hand-to-mouth statesman is to condemn his statesmanship. But in truth this is not so. The one certain fact of politics is the limited power possessed by mankind of making forecasts of the future. Mr. Senior has with patient accuracy recorded the speculations of almost all the most eminent foreign statesmen who lived and talked during the last thirty years. With two exceptions—Thiers and De Tocqueville—no one of them foresaw anything even of the immediate future; and though the cleverest of Frenchmen showed that he could cast a keen glance over the surface of politics, and the most profound political critic of the age certainly proved that a genius for analysis could be applied as powerfully to the present as to the past, yet the happy hits of even Thiers or De Tocqueville must be balanced against a hundred unhappy blunders. But, if all the acuteness of some of the acutest observers the world has seen proved unable to penetrate the secrets of the future even for a few years, the inference (confirmed by every page of history) must necessarily be drawn that politics cannot at present be based on supposed calculations of what is likely to happen in the future, but must in the main consist in endeavors to deal with the immediate and pressing needs of each day. Hand-to-mouth statesmanship is the statesmanship of common sense.

Nor let theorists suppose that this kind of policy requires for its successful discharge talents of a common or low order. It is in one sense more difficult of execution than schemes such as those of Mr. Cobden's, which are wholly governed by one or two obvious considerations. To promote free-trade and at all costs to secure peace may be noble objects; but the man who makes the attainment of these ends the sole scope of his efforts greatly simplifies the problems of his statesmanship. For their solution he needs one or two great gifts, but he may dispense with many of the talents, such as the experience, the promptitude, the coolness, the versatility, the knowledge of men, which are absolutely essential to the success of a minister whose aim it is to deal successfully with each of the complicated affairs of life as they in turn require his attention. What is above all needed by a statesman such as Palmerston is the capacity instinctively to recognize the relative value of the forces of which he can dispose, and of the forces with which he may come into conflict. To have in the main estimated fairly the immediate importance of the forces with which he had to deal seems at bottom to have been Palmerston's greatest claim to fame. He occasionally made bold strokes. He at least twice defeated Guizot. He supported Turkey against Russia and carried her through the contest with success. He estimated at pretty well its right figure both the strength and the weakness of Louis Napoleon, and in consequence stood firmly by Italy, and, without risking either English blood or English money, secured the most beneficial diplomatic triumph which has ever been achieved by an English statesman. Yet if his course of action be critically examined it will be found that Palmer-

* "The Life and Correspondence of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston. By the Hon. Evelyn Ashley, M.P." 2 vols. London: Richard Bentley & Son.

ston never acted with vigor unless he had secured force adequate to carry out his objects. He took the greatest care to be perfectly sure, before going into action, that he was supported by English sentiment, and further either that the task was one which England was powerful enough to accomplish alone, or that England was well provided with allies. Whenever he doubted his strength for a fight he held aloof or drew back. He detested Austria, yet he declined to interpose in favor of Hungary. He probably wished to help Denmark, yet no taunts would tempt him into a contest in which he might without a single ally have been called upon to meet the combined armies of Germany. He dealt summarily with the affair of the *Trent*, but, though he showed very little moral appreciation of the true issues involved in the war of secession, he declined all propositions which would have involved Great Britain in a contest with the United States. He knew that England was powerful, and acted on the knowledge; but he also knew, what his modern imitators forget, that a country may be a great power without being all-powerful, and acted as constantly with an eye to the limits as to the extent of English power.

The second and most obvious trait of Palmerstonian statesmanship is that it was governed by the conviction that an English minister is bound to consult the interests of England and to make his policy conform wholly to her interests. This is a doctrine which in recent times has met with much vituperation; but surely, if properly understood, it is open to no valid objection. A minister is the agent, not the master, of the nation. Like every other agent, high or low, he is bound to act for the benefit of his principal. In matters of business no one questions this maxim. A manager or an attorney who insisted upon doing acts of charity or generosity with his employer's money would certainly be cashiered, and probably might be compelled by a court of justice to refund the money he had wasted. Why should not the same rule apply to the agent who transacts the business of a nation? The reply generally is that to maintain the doctrine for which we are contending, and which every statesman worth his salt invariably in practice adopts, is equivalent to asserting that a politician is not bound by any rules of morality. This we utterly deny. A minister may find that the course which a nation is bent on pursuing is one to which he cannot lend a hand. Many Englishmen would have felt that no just man could have countenanced any scheme for giving English aid to the efforts of the Southern Confederacy. Let us suppose for a moment that England had been bent on this course. The duty of a statesman would have been clear: he ought to have retired from the Government. Here, again, the analogy of business applies. To say that an agent must look wholly to his principal's interests is very far from the same thing as saying that an agent is bound to carry out the business say of smuggling or slave-trading. Moreover, a man who goes into public life at all must almost of necessity be prepared to act on the assumption, which is perfectly justifiable, that the prosperity of his country is bound up with the prosperity of the world. Palmerston, at least, never opposed in his own mind the welfare of England to the welfare of other countries. He had none of the elements of a reformer: he was therefore saved from the grave error of confusing the functions of a prophet with those of a statesman. But it would be the gravest injustice to deny that in looking after the interests of England he did much for the freedom of mankind.

For the third and the best trait of Palmerston was his genuine dislike to oppression, and his keen perception of the fact that the interests of England were bound up with the cause of general liberty and of national independence. He was the true heir and disciple of Canning. On this matter he has scarcely received full justice. He, like his teacher, was far ahead of the statesmen who had preceded them. He, like his teacher, was constantly found fighting on what has proved to be the right side. He founded Belgian independence; he aided Greece; he supported constitutional government in Spain and Portugal; he was the firm friend of Italy; he withstood the aggressive despotism of Nicholas. Even his friendliness for Louis Napoleon (by far the worst point in his career) had this amount of justification, that he perceived far more clearly than most Englishmen that foreign courts hated the President, not because he had overthrown a republic, but because he might be expected to aid oppressed nationalities. In any case, though Lord Palmerston's judgment may in this, as in other instances, have suffered from a certain want of fine moral feeling, there is no doubt that in the main the bias of his mind was in harmony with English love of freedom. This is the point on which he differed far and wide from the miserable plagiarists who have in later days caught up his phrases without imbibing his spirit. Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Beaconsfield's followers have, from some fatal association of ideas, fancied that the interests of England were hostile to human freedom. The Austrian, the Pope, the Turk have each in turn enlisted their sympathies. They admired Louis Napoleon till Louis Napoleon attempted to deliver Italy. Hence, in their hands, pursuit of the interests of England has always meant hostility to the welfare of the world. From this error Lord Palmerston was free. If he followed the interests of England, he also made them promote the independence of Belgium, of Switzerland, and of Italy. Hence the constant harmony of his policy with what may be called the average moral

tone of the English people. It was certainly not Quixotic, it was not heroic; but it was based on good sense, it was manly and simple. If it did not appeal to the highest feelings, still less did it pander to the baser forms of national vanity and self-interest. England might do far worse than adhere to the "policy of Palmerston."

RECENT NOVELS.*

'*BEAUTY'S DAUGHTERS*,' by the anonymous author of '*Airy, Fairy Lilian*,' a book that had a great popular success, we believe, a year or two ago, is great trash of the fast but innocent order. It is founded clearly enough on Rhoda Broughton, but its successful imitation is confined to the constant use of the present tense, a vicious trick now grown threadbare, one would say. The author may claim the invention of a new type of hero, perhaps, the fortunate lover of one of the "daughters" being a man who has injured his spine on the hunting-field, and is introduced to his future wife as a bed-ridden invalid. The beautiful amiability of the pair is such that we experience some relief when after a year of matrimony an able young doctor restores the hero to a fair degree of health and strength. The second "daughter" achieves matrimonial happiness after the usual jealous struggle with the charming young widow and former love of her husband. There are a pair of friends nicknamed Brandy and Dandy who fill in odd corners and flirt with the widow till her time to be remarried comes, and a sharp young girl who is developing into a third "daughter."

'*A New Race*' is the rather misleading title of Mrs. Wister's latest translation from the German, which has the qualities, albeit a good deal diluted, of its predecessors. The heroine, whose mother has been wrongfully deprived by her husband's family of her fortune, is reinstated by her grandfather, who accomplishes the task, however, by something very like sharp practice, which his desire for revenge justifies to him. After his death she attempts to redress the wrong her cousin has suffered at his hands, and her success is followed by their happy marriage, and "the new race" that grows up in the old castle promises to inherit only the virtues of its ancestors—a fulfilment that would certainly entitle it to a new label. The story, it will be seen, is sufficiently mild, though it has romantic episodes.

'*The Octagon Club*' is a novel with a purpose; but the purpose changes its aspect so frequently, and so hopelessly entangles the thread of the narrative, that it is difficult to judge of the outcome. The briefest statement is that there are two happy marriages concluded in the intervals of long speculations on the problems of life and the world, and that the author's decision is that a modified communism is the next change to be met, that America is best fitted of all countries to meet it, and that in the ensuing conflict woman will take a lofty position.

For a harrowing tale of unrelieved misery commend us to Helen Campbell's '*Unto the Third and Fourth Generations*.' It has no literary merit that we can discover, unless an intention to elaborate the horrors to which a fanatical Calvinism may lead can be so called, or a depressing effect upon the reader be proof of literary power. The depression here produced, however, is of the nature of that excited by accounts of the execution of common criminals, and is relieved of intensity, and at the same time of dignity, by a certain ghastly absurdity. A virtuous young woman falls in love with a noble and true-hearted scapegrace, and, in spite of her father's curse, marries him. In a fit of passion he knocks down a man whom a casual sailor subsequently robs and kills. Robert's act has been witnessed by his closest friend; he is indicted, pleads guilty to the murder he supposes he must have committed, and is convicted of robbery and murder. Spite of his wife's efforts, duly detailed, he is forthwith hanged. Then she has to watch his grave to keep off the body-snatchers. When her son is born she considers that his father's curse is upon him, and through his boyhood religiously refrains from kissing him. This son goes West; is befriended by the witness against his father, who thus expiates his sorrow at having being obliged to testify in the case, and falls in love with this gentleman's daughter. They are about to be married when Robert's son discovers the reason of his patron's kindness and haughtily throws the young woman over. The truth about the casual sailor comes out, and then the young man feels free to wed the daughter of the man who had got his father unjustly hanged. After the marriage his mother "pressed his lips with the first mother's kiss they had ever known." This is the first gleam of sunshine, but it is soon shut in, the rest of the book, which chronicles the death of the mother, being, however, in the subdued tone of chastened and consecrated sorrow, as such writers conceive it.

'*A Stranded Ship*' is the least unimportant of three stories, by L. Clarke Davis, which are bound together. The hero, who murders his best friend in

* '*Beauty's Daughters*. By the author of '*Airy, Fairy Lilian*.' Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1886.

'*A New Race*. From the German of G. Raimund. By A. L. Wister. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1886.

'*The Octagon Club*: A Character Study. By E. M. H. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1886.

'*Unto the Third and Fourth Generations*. By Helen Campbell. New York: Ford, Howard & Hulbert, 1886.

'*A Stranded Ship*: A Story of Sea and Shore. By L. Clarke Davis. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1886.

the first chapter and subsequently leads a life of alternate dissipation and benevolence, in the last chapter risks his life to rescue the passengers of a wrecked ship. The last saved proves to be the supposed murdered man returning from foreign parts to clear his friend's name of a false charge. The change, conspicuous in this book and the last mentioned, from the old way of dealing with crime in fiction is, perhaps, worth notice, and suggests that if the moral accountability is to depend upon the legal aspect of the case, sagacious murderers who will choose victims of vigorous constitutions might be invented, that the reader may be left in no uncertainty as to the hero's real worth during the progress of the story.

'Uncle Jack's Executors,' without serious claims on the attention, is written with sufficient brightness to find many readers. The author, however, should be capable of better work, and may be advised to eschew melodramatic absurdity more attentively than she has here done, in spite of her assurance that her book is not of the class of "astonishing, convulsory literature." It is also to be remarked that her literary theories are not important, and that a curbing of the wit which is, nevertheless, what makes the volume readable would be an experiment worth trying. The best indication of her power is a character belonging to the order of Mrs. Nickleby.

The heroine of 'Ethel Dutton,' it may be confidently affirmed, would escape a lunatic asylum only within the covers of a particularly absurd novel. 'After Many Years' is all about kidnapped children and the conduct of an old-fashioned villain, who successfully postpones the explanation and happy termination until the closing chapters.

'Rev. Mr. Dashwell' is intended to pillory the sensational preacher who makes a trade of his profession, and readers of the book will wish the design had been better executed.

'Elsie's Widowhood' belongs to the Sunday-school series of 'Elsie Stories,' and calls for no comment, except the obvious one that the indefiniteness with which it is clear such a series may be prolonged must rob it of verisimilitude to any but very young readers.

Some of the 'Strange Stories' by Erckmann-Chatrian here collected we have a vague remembrance of having met with in some of the old magazines now not only discontinued but forgotten, at a time when these prolific authors were many years younger than they now are. At all events, such a haven is best adapted to their draught, and at present they seem as much out of date as they must always have been out of literature properly so understood. The best works of MM. Erckmann-Chatrian have a certain seriousness in light matters that bespeaks their Alsatian origin, but these little stories are completely German in the deliberateness of their weirdness and the *sang-froid*, so to speak, with which they rely for it upon the unexplained supernatural. Nothing like Poe's handling of psychological phenomena, or Hawthorne's fancy, or even De Quincey's, is to be discovered in them, and with the best intentions to the contrary they will keep no one awake nights; but they are readable enough, and they are sufficiently dread and romantic to be finished if once begun, which is getting to be fair commendation in the case of old-fashioned ghost-stories.

Report to the Trustees of the James Lick Trust of observations made on Mount Hamilton with reference to the location of Lick Observatory. By S. W. Burnham. (Chicago 1880. 4to, 32 pp. and plates.)—It is gratifying to learn that at last the difficulties in the way of carrying out the provisions of Mr. Lick's magnificent bequest of \$700,000 for the establishment of the "most powerful" telescope in the world at some point in California have been overcome, and that active steps are being taken in this important matter. A circular of the Trustees introducing the document before us reads as follows:

"The Trustees of the Lick Observatory, in presenting the accompanying report, beg to say that they will be glad to receive the publications of Observatories, and of Astronomical and Scientific Societies, for the permanent library of the Lick Observatory; and take this occasion to state that the preliminary work on Mount Hamilton has already been commenced, and will be prosecuted as rapidly as is possible under the circumstances. The smaller equatorial, of twelve inches aperture, has been ordered of Alvan Clark & Sons, and will be placed in position early in 1881; and the great equatorial, meridian circle, and other instruments, will be contracted for at an early day. It is not expected there will be any further delay in putting the Lick Observatory in complete working order, other than that incident to the importance and magnitude of the undertaking."

It is known that after various places had been proposed, Mr. Lick finally settled on the summit of Mount Hamilton, in Santa Clara County, as the site for the proposed observatory. This mountain is twenty-six miles by the road (thirteen miles in a straight line) from San José, which is itself about fifty miles by rail from San Francisco. The county of Santa Clara has built an excellent carriage-way to the top, the grade being kept at less than six feet and a half in

one hundred by windings. An approximately level space of about four hundred feet long, and of width varying from forty to one hundred and twenty feet, is four thousand two hundred and fifty feet above the sea-level, and commands the entire country within forty miles around. It became a serious question as to whether this isolated summit was a suitable place for the establishment of so important an observatory as is contemplated, and, acting on the advice of Professors Newcomb and Holden of the Naval Observatory at Washington, the trustees invited Mr. Burnham, of Chicago, the noted observer and discoverer of double stars, to make preliminary observations on the mountain to test the question. The plan was for Mr. Burnham to take his own telescope (a six-inch, by Alvan Clark) from Chicago to Mount Hamilton, and to observe at the latter place the objects with which he was familiar at home. The gain of establishing an observatory at this elevation would be tested by the comparative ease with which difficult known double stars could be seen, and by the new ones which might be discovered. There is probably no observer in the country whose opinion on this special point would be more valuable.

In pursuance of this plan, Mr. Burnham remained on the mountain from August 17 to October 16, 1879, inclusive. For the whole period of sixty days he divides the nights, astronomically, as follows:

First-class nights.....	42
Medium nights.....	7
Cloudy and foggy nights.....	11

By a first-class night Mr. Burnham means such a one as occurs in Chicago not more than ten or twelve times a year—a night when the most difficult and delicate measures are practicable, when the air is not only clear but steady, so that stars are bright but do not twinkle. A peculiarity of the vision on Mt. Hamilton is that the night, if good at any part, is good throughout, which is quite different from experience at lower stations, or at the few high ones that have been tested. The quality of the vision during the day was inferior to this; it was clear, but the images of stars, etc., were not tranquil. Hence only certain observations of the sun can be prosecuted with special advantage here. The indications are that in all observations of stars or planets this is a site better fitted for a new and well-equipped observatory than any other in the world. The remarkable dryness of the air seems to be connected with its excellent quality for astronomical work. Mr. Burnham's report contains a great number of measures of known double stars, and of new ones discovered, and to the astronomer the examination of this list is the surest proof of the conclusions he has reached.

It appears that an admirable site has been selected, and that a suitably-equipped observatory placed here cannot fail to be of important service. It is understood that preliminary plans for cheap, commodious, and serviceable buildings have been prepared, and that some of the instruments, at least, will soon be in position. Only a part of the endowment will be spent for outfit, the balance remaining as a fund for maintenance. The conservative spirit shown in the plans already carried out promises a career of useful work to this latest of the great observatories of the world.

Chinese Buddhism. By Rev. Joseph Edkins, D.D. (London: Trübner & Co.; Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1880.)—The subject of "Chinese Buddhism" must always be an interesting one, if only on account of the number of people who belong to that section of the Buddhist community. In fact, in one way or other the whole of what is called Northern Buddhism (except, perhaps, that form of it known in Nepal) is connected with China. The Tibetan and Mongolian books were mostly translated from Chinese versions of the Buddhist Scriptures, whilst the Japanese use the same sacred canon as is generally accepted in China. We are compelled, therefore, to examine these translations if we would understand the character of the religion founded on them. Dr. Edkins, from his long residence in China and his acquaintance with its language, is well able to give us much information on the subject. The present work, however, is not so much the result of his latest reading and examination of the Buddhist religion as it is a reproduction in a continuous form of his treatises and essays already published. This, of course, is a great advantage to those who are unable to obtain the magazines, etc., in which the original papers appeared; but it is disappointing to others who looked for some new work and wider research from the hands of this trustworthy writer.

The plan of the book is an excellent one. The author first gives us a life of Buddha from the time of his birth till he entered Nirvana. From what particular work he derives his information on this subject we are not told. There are more than ten distinct treatises in China professing to give the life of Buddha. Perhaps that found in the Vinaya Pitaka is the most reliable. The shortest and most interesting, however, is that known as the *Pen-Fi-king*. From whatever sources Dr. Edkins gathered his materials, they are tolerably correct, though we must object to the restoration of *Godinia* for *Kāundinya*, and it is to be regretted that such an error as that found on p. 35, and the note at the foot of the page, should have remained uncorrected. The Chinese *Ho-shang* cannot be derived from *Upāsaka*. In fact, Dr.

'Uncle Jack's Executors.' By Annette Lucile Noble. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1880.

'Ethel Dutton.' By Mattie May. Boston: Loring. 1880.

'After Many Years.' By Robert Bogue. New York: The Authors' Publishing Co. 1880.

'Rev. Mr. Dashwell.' By E. P. R. Philadelphia: John E. Potter & Co. 1880.

'Elsie's Widowhood.' By Martha Finley. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1880.

'Strange Stories.' By Erckmann-Chatrian. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

Edkins seems to be aware of the mistake when he implies, on p. 143, that the original Sanskrit form of the word was *Upādhyāya*, although here again he endorses the strange error of Dr. Eitel, who translates the simple phrase *ts'in-klan-ssu* by "self-taught teacher," instead of "personal instructor."

Following the life of Buddha we have a good chapter (the fifth) on the Patriarchs of the Northern Buddhists. This is a very important study. It is probable that many events recorded about these patriarchs may contain some historical truth. For example, the patriarch Upagupta, the fourth in succession, is unknown in the South, but in the North he is celebrated as being a contemporary of Aśoka, and the first who introduced a schism into the Buddhist Church. This may probably account for the succession of Theras in the South agreeing with the North no further than Sonaka or Sanakavāsa, after whom we have only one patriarch before Aśoka the Good. And here again comes in the question about the two Aśokas, and whether the Southern patriarch Siggava was not the orthodox successor of Sonaka, in the place of Upagupta. Take, again, the patriarch Singalaputra, the twenty-fourth in the list; we have an important record of this priest that he was the last of the line who dwelt in the Northern regions bordering on the Swat River, and that he and thousands of his followers were slaughtered by Mahavākāla. This king probably lived about 450 A.D., so that we may from this date, if it be correct, gather roughly the date of the patriarch and his predecessors. Anyhow, these questions are mixed up with the history of the patriarchs, and are deserving of notice.

In his sketch of the history of Buddhism in China Dr. Edkins shows his extensive reading and accurate judgment. This portion of his book, as it appeared in the *Shanghai Almanac* many years ago, attracted general notice in China, and has been frequently made use of by other writers on the subject. Our author is at home, too, when treating on the T'ien T'ai school of Buddhism; his visits among the secluded monasteries where Chi-k'ai, the founder of this school, lived and died in the sixth century, have been recorded among his essays in the *Almanac* referred to before, and the accounts are full of interest and instruction. The least satisfactory part of the work is the translation of the Shaster known as the *Ekasloka* (cap. xix.). We have always felt surprise at Dr. Edkins's version of the opening verse (*Gāthā*) of this short treatise. Surely the right translation of the first line of this verse is not "My body (or substance) in its nature is not permanent," but "The nature of self-existent substance (*svabhāva*) is impermanency." The entire treatise is intended to overthrow the *svabhāvika* school of Buddhism, and so it is explained in the sequel of the Shaster, although Dr. Edkins restores the original words used in the Chinese to "*svabhāva*," which has no meaning. We must also object to the translation found on page 316, where the well-known phrase *yih-ts'ie-fa* is strangely rendered "all acts," as though the meaning of *ye dhammā* could be doubted as referring to all phenomenal existence.

These and other imperfections are much to be regretted. We want some careful account of Chinese Buddhism from a resident scholar in that country; Dr. Edkins is the best qualified person to write on the subject. It requires something more, however, than a mere reproduction of old matter to put the question as it is now understood before the student. If this work should reach a second edition, it is to be hoped the author will carefully revise it and give the world the result of his latest reading on the subject.

Deutsche Urzeit. Von Wilhelm Arnold. (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes. 12mo, pp. 441. 1879.)—The distinguished historian of the German cities, Professor Wilhelm Arnold, has of late years devoted himself especially to the earlier period of German history. His 'Wanderungen und Ansiedelungen der deutschen Stämme,' published a few years ago, is now followed up by 'Deutsche Urzeit' (The Primitive Age of Germany), in which he gives, in a compendious form, a complete account of the early history, institutions, and customs of the Germans. It is in two books, each containing four chapters; the first book, the history, contains Prehistoric Migrations, the Contests with the Romans, the "Pfahlgraben," and the Formation of New Races; the second book, on the internal condition of the Germans, treats of their Civilization, Art of War, Constitution, and Religion. The special feature of the earlier work, 'Wanderungen und Ansiedelungen,' was the attempt to trace the history of society by the aid of local names; this was equally remarkable for detailed knowledge, ingenuity, and sound judgment,

and the book has been uniformly recognized as a very valuable contribution to early German history. In the present work we have the principal results of these investigations presented summarily and in connection with the information derived from other sources. In treating of the Thuringians, for example, he points out (p. 169) that the suffix *leben* is found in a series of towns reaching from northern Schleswig to the neighborhood of Würzburg, and nowhere else. This fact he brings in connection with the fact that Angles were found in Thuringia as well as among the Saxons, and draws the inference that there had been a migration of this Lower-German nation from the Cimbric Peninsula into the heart of Germany. We find on page 165 the useful remark that national names as names of localities (e.g., *Thüringenhausen* and *Holzengel*) indicate either scattered places of foreign settlers, or, in old times, frontier places. Perhaps the most original part of the book is the chapter upon the *Pfahlgraben*, or line of fortifications carried from the Rhine in the neighborhood of Mentz to the Danube by Domitian and Hadrian; probably the great historical importance of this work has never before been adequately shown. It made, he thinks, the turning point in the history of the Germans. Southwestern Germany now became Roman territory, under the name *Agri Decumates* (either *tithe-lands* or *measured lands*), while the Germans beyond this enclosure were for a long series of years checked in their incursions and migrations. From this time, therefore, begins definitely their settlement in permanent habitations, and their transition from a half-nomadic to an agricultural life. Two hundred years later the enfeebled Empire could no longer withstand their attacks, and the *Limes* ceased to be a boundary; but the Germans proper had by this time passed completely out of their nomadic condition. The great civilizing work of the structure had been accomplished.

Professor Arnold takes an intermediate position in regard to two important questions which have been hotly disputed, chiefly between Frenchmen and Germans. In his view the Germans of Cæsar and Tacitus were neither savages nor peasants of the nineteenth century; they were, he says (p. 216), "wandering tillers of the soil, or agricultural nomads, as one pleases." And the apparent discrepancies between Cæsar and Tacitus he explains rationally by pointing out that there were a hundred and fifty years between the two historians, and that the account given by Tacitus represents a somewhat more advanced state of society than Cæsar's. The second question is the nature of the conquest, and this he reminds us differed widely in different countries. "It was an essentially different thing whether they [the Germans] were only tolerated in the Empire, colonized as subject to military duty, or taken into the pay of the Emperor, as was the case in the main even with the Visigoths, Burgundians, and Ostrogoths; or whether they went actively to work, took possession of Roman soil by the right of conquest, and established things as they pleased—in other words, became masters, as the Anglo-Saxons, the Vandals, and afterwards the Langobards, did" (p. 183). He does not say, it will be noticed, in which category the Franks belonged.

Elementary Treatise on Electric Batteries. Translated from the French of Alfred Niaudet. (New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1880.)—M. Niaudet's work is an illustrated cyclopædia of electric batteries, containing a brief history of their origin, and describing in detail the construction and modes of operation of all the forms of batteries known. Plain definitions are given of the few technical terms employed, and the "general remarks" interspersed through the work explain so much of the science of the subject as is necessary to enable the reader to comprehend the peculiarities of the various kinds of batteries, and their especial adaptability to different uses. The translation is almost literal, and preserves the simple, direct style of the author. As is justly said in the short preface by Mr. George D'Infreville, of this city, "Telegraphers generally will find many of their frequently-recurring problems solved in its pages," the perspicuity of which will save both inventors and investigators from useless experiment, while at the same time offering them new fields for careful research.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Brown (R.), *Science for All*, Parts 16-18, swd. (Cassell, Petter & Galpin) 80 50
Champer (V.), *L'Année Artistique* (J. W. Bouton)
Parker (Col. F. J.), *Story of the 2nd Regiment Mass. Infantry* (C. W. Calkins & Co.)
Perceval (Rev. J.), *Some Helps for School Life* (Pott, Young & Co.)
Saint Paul (A.), *L'Année Archéologique* (J. W. Bouton)
Seguin (Dr. E.), *Report on Education*, 2d ed. (Doerflinger Book and Pub. Co.)
Valframbert (C.), *Répertoire Politique et Historique*, 1879. (J. W. Bouton)
Vapereau (G.), *Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains*, Part 8, swd. (F. W. Christern)

LEISURE-HOUR SERIES.

16mo, 81 per volume.

The Mudfog Papers, etc.

By CHARLES DICKENS, Author of 'The Pickwick Papers,' etc.

Troublesome Daughters.

By L. B. WALFORD, author of 'Mr. Smith,' etc.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

NOW READY.

Van Velzer's Complete Six per Cent. Interest Tables.

Containing an accurate calculation of interest at six per cent. on all sums from one to one thousand dollars by single dollars, and from one thousand to fifteen thousand by hundreds. By C. A. Van Velzer, Fellow in Mathematics, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. Making a book of 106 pp., 8vo, printed on heavy paper and substantially bound with leather back. Price \$1.25, or, with marginal index, \$1.50. For sale by booksellers, or sent by mail upon receipt of price.

FENCH & AFGAR, Publishers, Ithaca, N. Y.

Kissena Nurseries.

Japanese Maples, Rhododendrons, Hardy and Greenhouse Azaleas, Camellias, Roses, Purple Beech, in large quantities. Fruit and Ornamental Trees, Shrubs, and Vines. Price-lists free.

PARSONS & SONS CO.

(Limited),

FLUSHING, N. Y.

tion
sults
for-
ex-
wns
no-
vere
that
bric
re-
and
old
the
ine
an ;
een
of
der
the
eir
eir
dic
uld
y ;
eir
en

or-
en
er
6),
nd
lly
vo
re
of
s,
ly
ne
r-
s-
y
s,
e

f
s
f
s
e
-
t
e
f
-
e
e